

JOURNAL OF THE SOCIETY OF ORIENTAL RESEARCH

EDITED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

PROFESSOR IN THE WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, CHICAGO

Volume II

MARCH, 1918

Number 1

EDITORIAL NOTE

So far as can be ascertained, many of the European periodicals in our field have been discontinued. It is all the more urgent, therefore, that we, who have not yet felt the stress and strain of war to any considerable degree, should go on, and keep going on. Along the lines of scientific investigation, where Europe has been forced to suspend operations, we should count it a duty and privilege to work. Europe has abundantly sowed; we are entering into her heritage. We now must sow that she and others may reap.

Students of the Nearer East and Biblical World cannot be indifferent to what is transpiring at the present time in Palestine and Mesopotamia, and hail with joy the prospect of being able to carry on Biblical and Oriental research in these two lands in the future without the unnecessary interference of a dilatory and unsympathetic government.

In this number of our JOURNAL, we are glad to be able to publish the first of a series of Semitic, Egyptian, and Ancient Oriental Liturgical bibliographies, which will continue to appear in succeeding issues.

Journal of the Society of Oriental Research

EARLY EGYPTIAN MORALS

By SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, Western Theological Seminary, Chicago

I. INTRODUCTION

THE morals of an ancient people can be discovered only by a study of their extant literature. The early Egyptians — Egyptians who lived previous to the Middle Kingdom — have apparently left us no system of morals. To find out what their moral ideas were, we are obliged to pick up here and there in their extant writings material definitive of their habits, customs, and laws.

The moral ideas of any people are to be defined by their conception of goodness, purity, faithfulness, truth, justice, and righteousness, on the one hand; and, on the other, by that of evil, impurity, faithlessness, falsehood, injustice, and wickedness. What constitutes goodness, purity, etc., and evil, impurity, etc., is the moral content. We must aim at discovering what those acts were which the early Egyptians called "good," and those which they called "bad." His conscience, or inherited and self-developed power of moral distinctions, classified things as "right" and "wrong." They were "right" and "wrong" according as they were agreeable or contrary to accepted custom and law. A study of the customs and laws of early Egypt, then, will reveal to us its state of morals.

In our study, we must be careful to distinguish between the ideal and the real. It is helpful to know the ideals of a people; but a people is commended or condemned, as a rule, according as their actual practices are comparatively high or low.

The fragmentary nature of early Egyptian literature does not allow of a complete systematization of morals; and because contemporary literature is the only reliable source for the study of the morals of any age that is past, great care must be taken in the matter of the date of our sources.

The main sources used in this study are: First, early Egyptian historical, biographical, and business inscriptions; secondly, legal

documents; and, thirdly, religious material, especially the Pyramid Texts.¹

My method has been: first, to assemble all moral materials in all literature of the early Egyptian period, classifying them, so as to show what the family, social, international, transcendental, and personal virtues and vices were; and, secondly, to estimate early Egyptian morals by an examination of the moral ideals, the idea of moral evil, the question of free-will, and the moral sanctions. Due care has been taken to allow for the moral determinants of the age, and to differentiate between national and individual responsibility.

II. MORAL MATERIALS

I. *Family Virtues and Vices*

The earliest inscriptions reveal the family in Egypt as the social unit with its prototype in the life of the gods. The normal divine family consisted of father, mother, and son; such as, Osiris, Isis, and Horus. The earliest Egyptians known to us historically, therefore, traced the family, as the unit of society, back to the gods.

Whether there was anything in early Egyptian life corresponding to a betrothal among modern peoples cannot as yet be determined, nor can it be made out whether any contract whatever, whether expressed or understood, preceded the marriage contract.

Marriage among the early Egyptians normally consisted in the union of one man with one woman; in other words, marriage was monogamous. The king as well as the peasant could have but one legal wife. This may be fairly assumed from the nature of the ideal divine family, as well as from the early monuments which so often represent husband and one wife as the nucleus of the family.²

So far as our literary material will allow, there is no means of determining whether there were any legal impediments to marriage.

¹ Abbreviations in this article are: BAR = J. H. Breasted, *Ancient Records of Egypt*, Chicago, 1906, Vol. I; EEF = *Egypt Exploration Fund*, London, 1883 ff.; JSOR = *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*, Chicago, 1917 f.; LD = R. Lepsius, *Denkmäler aus Aegypten und Aethiopien*, Berlin, 1849-58; PRT = W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Royal Tombs*, London,

1900-01; PT = K. Sethe, *Die Alt-ägyptischen Pyramidentexte*, Leipzig, 1908 ff.; RT = *Recueil de Travaux relatifs à la philologie et à l'archéologie égyptiennes et assyriennes*, Paris, 1870 ff.; ZAS = *Zeitschrift für ägyptische Sprache*, Leipzig, 1863 ff.

² B. Poertner, *Die ägyptischen Totenstellen*, Paderborn, 1911, 17 ff.

At any rate, there seemed to be no degrees of consanguinity. The king could marry his sister, and commonly did so,³ and there is no evidence that the custom was not general.

Nor do our sources teach us how the average early Egyptian procured his bride, whether by purchase or conquest, as among other ancient peoples, or whether the marriage was based upon mutual consent. Perhaps the normal way was to receive her freely from the hand of her father. This was true, at any rate, in the case of Ptahshepses of the Fifth Dynasty who records that "his majesty gave to him the king's eldest daughter, Matkha, as his wife." (BAR, I, 257).

That polygamy, or better, concubinage, was common is to be assumed, not only on the basis of general conditions characteristic of antiquity, but also because we find that in the Pyramid Texts reference is made to the mistresses of the pharaoh even in the hereafter,⁴ and in this life it was usual to call a woman *Nebtef*, "his mistress."⁵

The early Egyptian family was patriarchal. The father was the possessor;⁶ yet there is no evidence of any such paternal power over different members of the family as is seen in Sumerian times.⁷ On the contrary the oldest Egyptian monuments represent man and wife as equal,⁸ and inscriptions record how the husband treated his wife with honor⁹ and love.¹⁰ One of a man's chief concerns, in this life, was for his wife, and he was not forgetful of her future after his death, either in this world¹¹ or in the next.¹²

In the goddess Isis was personified the fidelity of the Egyptian wife, a characteristic brought out very clearly in the stelas of the Old Kingdom where one so often sees the wife sitting in an attitude of love and confidence with her arm about her husband.¹³ Sometimes a woman rose to a position of great importance, as in the case of Neit-hetep, who, it seems, legitimated the first Egyptian dynasty.¹⁴ In religious matters likewise the wife took a leading part in the cultus, and women were sometimes priestesses.¹⁵

³ Rougé, *Inscriptions hiéroglyphiques*, Paris, 1877-79, 153.

⁴ PT, § 123.

⁵ Cf. ZAS, 20, 37.

⁶ BAR, I, 328-337; 357.

⁷ See Mercer, "Sumerian Morals" (JSOR, I, 47 ff.)

⁸ Poertner, *op. cit.*, 22.

⁹ Rougé, *op. cit.*, 82; Mariette, *Les*

Mastabas de l'ancien empire, Paris, 1881-87, 308.

¹⁰ BAR, I, 88.

¹¹ BAR, I, 155.

¹² BAR, I, 87.

¹³ Poertner, *passim*.

¹⁴ Cf. Petrie, *A History of Egypt*, New York, 1899, I, 14.

¹⁵ Mariette, *op. cit.*, 183.

Family love seems, so far as can be judged from the inscriptions, to have been the most prominent characteristic of the home life of early Egyptians. Again and again we read in the biographies of officials of the Old Kingdom: "Never did I judge two brothers in such a way that a son was deprived of his paternal possession. I was one beloved of his father, praised of his mother, whom his brothers and sisters loved."¹⁶ So common did the sentiment expressed by these words become that the phrase grew to be stereotyped. The parents' joy in their children is revealed in the names they gave them; it was common for a daughter to be called "beauty-comes," or a son to be named "riches."

The most common of all family virtues was filial love. This is most beautifully illustrated in the story of the relationship between Horus and his father Osiris,¹⁷ as well as in the solicitude with which Zau of the Sixth Dynasty made preparations for the proper burial of his father, and in the sincere filial love which prompted him to provide for a future resting place for himself beside his father.¹⁸ He said: "Now, I caused that I should be buried in the same tomb with this Zau (his father), in order that I might be with him in one place; not, however, because I was not in a position to make a second tomb; but I did this in order that I might see this Zau every day; in order that I might be with him in one place."¹⁹ It was a son's privilege and duty not only to provide a suitable burial for his father, but likewise to see to its maintenance.²⁰ In this he was carrying out his father's wish,²¹ and for which he was highly praised.²² The stelas of the Old Kingdom show us how united the early Egyptian family was. We see now after the lapse of nearly 5000 years the father and mother arm in arm, and their children standing or sitting near them.²³ Respect and reverence were the parents' due.²⁴

Normally a man succeeded to his paternal inheritance, and it was considered wrong to do anything calculated to disturb this balance.²⁵ But the line of inheritance could be through the daughter, as in the case of Neit-hetep,²⁶ and that is, perhaps, why Zau petitioned the

¹⁶ BAR, I, 357; cf. 127, 172, 281, etc.

¹⁷ PT, §§ 575 ff.

¹⁸ BAR, I, 382, 383.

¹⁹ BAR, I, 383.

²⁰ BAR, I, 182-187.

²¹ BAR, I, 86.

²² BAR, I, 165.

²³ Poertner, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

²⁴ BAR, I, 103.

²⁵ BAR, I, 163, 172, etc.

²⁶ See note 14.

king for the right of succession to his father's home,²⁷ although here there might have been special statutory conditions which governed the succession. But the frequency of the assertion: "Never did I judge two brothers in such a way that a son was deprived of his paternal possession,"²⁸ would seem to show that filial succession was the normal one, and that a son inherited even the good name of his father, as when King Pepi II says to Harkhuf in a letter to him: "His majesty will make thy many excellent honors to be an ornament for the son of thy son forever."²⁹

The daughter's place in the family love was no less secure than that of the son. The stelas of this early period show us the daughter as well as the son in the family circle;³⁰ and she could inherit. In fact, the ties of blood relationship were commonly reckoned through the female side of the family.³¹ The early Egyptian took as much pride in his sisters' love as he did in that of his brother and parents, when he asserted that he was one "beloved of his father, praised of his mother, whom his brothers and sisters loved."³²

Family love is the ideal relationship not only between parent and child but likewise between child and child. The characteristic of being a brother is to keep peace with one's brother, as is seen in the desired relationship between Horus and Set.³³

In early Egypt, as elsewhere, there must have been means, other than death, whereby the marriage relationship was interrupted. But what they were the scantiness of our sources will not allow us to determine.

2. *Social Virtues and Vices*

Early Egyptian society may be said to have consisted of three classes: (1) the king and the nobility; (2) lower officials; (3) laborers, peasants, and slaves. As we are dependent entirely upon contemporary literature for our knowledge of society in these early days, and as the extant material consists mostly of stelas and mortuary inscriptions of the great and rich, our knowledge of the king and his nobles, civil and religious, is comparatively full, as is also that of

²⁷ BAR, I, 385.

²⁸ BAR, I, 331, 357, etc.

²⁹ BAR, I, 352.

³⁰ Poertner, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

³¹ A. Erman, *Life in Ancient Egypt*, London, 1894, 156 f.

³² BAR, I, 163, etc.

³³ A. Erman, *Ein Denkmal memphitischer Theologie*, Berlin, 1911, 932.

laborers and slaves; but of the lower officials and especially of artisans and shopmen we know almost nothing.

At the top of the social scale stood the king. He was considered a very god and was worshipped as such.³⁴ Among the earliest kings of Egypt were Horus and Set whose two tribes were finally united under the leadership of a human-divine king in whom "the two deities were at peace,"³⁵ and who assumed as one of his titles the name "Horus."

As a "great god" or "good god," the pharaoh was absolute on earth — a wise but beneficent despot. He was the head of his people and their representative to the gods. He is their protector³⁶ and as such is represented as the lord of truth (*neb maât*)³⁷ who established truth,³⁸ the law-maker, and judge,³⁹ the utterer of justice,⁴⁰ who as the heir of Osiris "judges justice before Rā,"⁴¹ and sits as judge with the assessors of Osiris in the next world.⁴² His righteousness is never questioned for he is "righteous in the sight of the sky and of the earth."⁴³ He is the very prototype or image and earthly manifestation of the power, goodness, and providence of the gods. Uni prays that the gods come and live with him.⁴⁴ Endowed with almost omnipotence and omniscience,⁴⁵ the pharaoh was the benefactor and life-giver of his people.⁴⁶ In short, the ancient Egyptians considered the pharaoh a model of perfection, and the favorite of the gods, the good and peaceful ruler,⁴⁷ whose waking is in peace.⁴⁸

On the other hand, it must not be imagined that the king actually lived up to the peoples' ideal, nor that the people did not often discover his imperfections. In the Pyramid Texts (§ 510) we are told that the king "is the man who takes women from their husbands whenever he wills and when his heart desires," and that even in the next world the pharaoh has his mistresses (Pyramid Texts, § 123), but as we shall hereafter learn in our study of the attributes of the

³⁴ See J. Baillet, *Le Régime Pharaonique*, Paris, 1912, Tome I, 1 ff.; also Mercer, "Emperor-Worship in Egypt" (JSOR, I, 10 ff.)

³⁵ Petrie, *op. cit.*, 28.

³⁶ Abydos II, EEF, 41; BAR, I, 83.

³⁷ For discussion of *maât*, see below.

³⁸ PT, § 265.

³⁹ Baillet, *op. cit.*, 271-320.

⁴⁰ PT, §§ 1774a-1776b.

⁴¹ PT, §§ 1774a-1776b.

⁴² Baillet, *op. cit.*, 291, notes 1 and 2.

⁴³ PT, § 1188; cf. §§ 1219a, 1306c.

⁴⁴ PT, §§ 376 ff.

⁴⁵ Baillet, *op. cit.*, I, 227 ff.

⁴⁶ BAR, I, 83.

⁴⁷ BAR, I, 181, 187.

⁴⁸ PT, §§ 1478, 1518.

Egyptian gods, this was nothing more than a right inherent in divinity and, therefore, belonging to the gods and to the pharaoh as a god.

The state's duty towards the pharaoh may be summed up in the words "Emperor-worship." The king was a god and the state's duty towards him was that of reverence, adoration, and obedience.⁴⁹ Yet the royal decrees of the Old Kingdom speak very eloquently of the rights of the people. In them we see the growth of a real democratic idea. They teach us that the rights of each sanctuary depended upon public authority and that once a decree was made and published, granting certain rights and privileges, no law could repeal the same, not even royal authority. This idea sprang from priestly power — the right of certain temples to exemption from taxation, but it was nevertheless an idea pregnant with democratic possibilities.⁵⁰

The relation of king to subject in early Egypt is that of god and ruler to suppliant and subject. The king's first duty was to act the god to his people. Then, he assured them of protection against every evil. He was their god, their sovereign protector, and defender.

The individual's first duty to the king is that of respect and adoration. The *ḥsyw* are those who sing the divine praises of the king.⁵¹ Man is the servant of the king, and as such owes him his obedience. From the royal relative (*rh nī swt*) and noble (*śāḥ*) to the peasant and slave the duty towards the pharaoh was that of adoration, love, obedience, and loyalty. But the duty was not irksome — far from it. The height of ambition was to do what the king desired,⁵² to be the beloved of the king,⁵³ and to be more honored by the king than any servant.⁵⁴ A common title was *mry nb-f*, "loved of his lord," and parents named their children after the king, e. g., *Ppy wśr*, "Pepi is strong." The subject believed that the virtues of his sovereign were a reflection of the justice and goodness of the gods.

The relationship between individuals may be considered in a two-fold way; first, the relation between superior and inferior, and,

⁴⁹ Baillet, *op. cit.*, II, 363 ff.; Mercer, "Emperor'-Worship in Egypt," *passim*.

⁵⁰ R. Weill, *Les Decrets Royaux*, Paris, 1912, 38 ff.; 72 ff.

⁵¹ ZAS, 13, 69.

⁵² BAR, I, 160.

⁵³ BAR, I, 118.

⁵⁴ BAR, I, 118; cf. 115.

secondly, the relation between inferior and superior. The duty of superior to inferior could not be better illustrated than by quoting a part of the inscription on the tomb of a nobleman of the Fifth Dynasty: "I gave bread to all the hungry of the Cerastes-mountain; I clothed him who was naked therein. I filled its shores with large cattle, and its lowlands with small cattle. . . . I never oppressed one in possession of his property, so that he complained of me because of it to the god of my city; (but) I spake, and told that which was good; never was there one fearing because of one stronger than he, so that he complained because of it to the god."⁵⁵ Henku, thus, considered it his duty to feed the hungry, clothe the naked, defend his people's rights, and do that which was good. In short, his rôle was that of protector and defender to those dependent upon him. Nor is this an isolated example. There were many other nobles who boasted of the same good deeds.⁵⁶ Another asserts that "every neighbor was supplied with water, and every citizen had Nile water to his heart's desire;"⁵⁷ another said: "I was open-handed to everyone;"⁵⁸ and still another proclaims that he never did "aught of violence towards any person."⁵⁹ This may also indicate a great deal of self-praise and boasting, but it is an indication of what the ideal relationship was.

The subordinate was respectful, submissive, and obedient to his superior and the nobleman's ideal was to conduct himself in such a way as to elicit his inferiors' love, e. g., Nezemib caused to be inscribed upon his tomb the assertion that he "was one beloved of the people," that he had "never taken the property of any man by violence," and that he "was a doer of that which pleased all men."⁶⁰

The king as representative of the gods was the source of all law and justice. A guarantee of justice was called *ā nī-šwt*, "the king's writings";⁶¹ and decrees issued by the king were law, and should not be forgotten.⁶² The representative of the king in the administration of justice was the judge (*sab*) whose patron deities were Set⁶³ and Maât, goddess of truth, especially the latter whose priests were,

⁵⁵ BAR, I, 281.

⁵⁶ See BAR, I, 357, etc.

⁵⁷ BAR, I, 407.

⁵⁸ BAR, I, 395.

⁵⁹ BAR, I, 252.

⁶⁰ BAR, I, 279.

⁶¹ BAR, I, 175.

⁶² R. Weill, *Les Decrets Royaux, Paris*, 1912, 34.

⁶³ PT, § 582; cf. RT, 5: 20.

as a rule, judges.⁶⁴ There were also chief justices (*tayty*), who were "high priests of the great god."⁶⁵

Judging from the mass of legal literature in later Egyptian times, it may be assumed that in early Egypt legal procedure began to be organized. But our extant material is as yet meagre, though sufficient to show that the Egyptian had a tendency to regulated justice at all times.

Royal charters were common in early Egypt, and had developed into an exact form of legal contract. A typical royal charter or decree contained as many as eight separate and distinct points arranged in logical order: (1) the name of Horus and the date, (2) general title and lists of those interested, (3) object of the decree, (4) a summons to all officers to respect and enforce the decree, (5) a statement of the irrevocability of the decree, (6) prohibition of alteration, (7) direction to be inscribed on stone and made public, (8) malediction on all violating the decree. When the decree was made and published, no authority, not even that of the king, could revoke it.⁶⁶

There is sufficient evidence to show that legal contracts were very common in ancient Egypt.⁶⁷ There is extant a legal document pertaining to litigation between an heir and an ancestor;⁶⁸ and there is the testamentary enactment of an official of the Fourth Dynasty, establishing the endowment of his tomb, in which the following items follow one another logically: (1) introduction, (2) description of endowment, (3) entailment, (4) punishment for violation.⁶⁹ The whole testament is framed in the most exact legal formulae. A lady, *Nebsept*, of the Third Dynasty made a will in favor of her children;⁷⁰ and similar extant wills represent the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties.⁷¹

The law was continually appealed to; legal trials were given all men,⁷² and a legal hearing was customary.⁷³ Justice was recognized, and to be just was the source of much pride. The great judges of early Egypt never tired of the boast: "Never did I judge two

⁶⁴ Rougé, *op. cit.*, 81, 87; Mariette, *op. cit.*, 165, 218, 229, etc.

⁶⁵ Rougé, *op. cit.*, 96 f., 153; Mariette, *op. cit.*, 149.

⁶⁶ See Weill, *op. cit.*, 36 ff.

⁶⁷ See Weill, *op. cit.*, *passim*; K. Sethe, *Aegyptische Inschrift auf den Kauf eines Hauses aus dem alten Reich*, Leipzig, 1911.

⁶⁸ Erman und Krebs, *Aus den Papyrus der Koenig. Museen*, Berlin, 1899, 82 f.

⁶⁹ BAR, I, 201 ff.

⁷⁰ BAR, I, 175.

⁷¹ BAR, I, 224, 225; 338.

⁷² E. g., BAR, I, 307, 310.

⁷³ PT, § 1027.

brothers in such a way that a son was deprived of his paternal possessions." ⁷⁴ The nomarch, Kheti I, caused to be recorded that while he ruled, "the child was not smitten beside his mother, nor the citizen beside his wife." ⁷⁵ The law must be obeyed by great as well as by small; ⁷⁶ every official must be at his post so that order may prevail and justice be done; ⁷⁷ and there must be no violence and oppression. ⁷⁸ But punishment is sure to follow disobedience, ⁷⁹ although the punishment was extraordinarily severe, e. g., the violator of a royal decree was to be sacrificed upon a block. ⁸⁰

There seem to have been no persons especially privileged in respect to property in ancient Egypt. Anyone could possess property, and the law defended his rights. The nomarchs loved to boast that they "never oppressed one in possession of his property" ⁸¹ or that they never took "the property of any man by violence." ⁸²

Property could be acquired in various ways, but especially by inheritance; an heir, of whatever relationship, was protected in his inheritance. ⁸³ A woman could not only inherit property, but she could likewise leave it by will to her children. ⁸⁴

Property was subject to taxation, but certain exemptions could be made. Religious institutions have, at almost all times, been exempted, and ancient Egypt was not an exception. We have an excellent example of a royal decree given by Pepi II of the Sixth Dynasty exempting a temple at Koptos from taxation. It is drawn up in a most precise legal manner: (1) the king's Horus name, (2) the high royal functionaries to whom it is addressed, (3) description of the sacred domain to be exempted, (4) detail of public works from which exemption is granted, (5) the prohibition to require taxation, (6) the king's dispensation, and (7) an order for the execution of the decree. ⁸⁵

The early Egyptians were not a great commercial people. Their national boundaries were such as to shut them out from very free access to foreign nations. Yet early Egyptian history records commercial expeditions to inner Africa, to Sinai, Syria, and Asia Minor.

⁷⁴ BAR, I, 331, 357, etc.

⁷⁵ BAR, I, 404.

⁷⁶ Weill, *op. cit.*, 36 ff.

⁷⁷ BAR, I, 404.

⁷⁸ BAR, I, 404, 281.

⁷⁹ Weill, *op. cit.*, 35.

⁸⁰ Weill, *op. cit.*, 35.

⁸¹ BAR, I, 281.

⁸² BAR, I, 279.

⁸³ BAR, I, 225, 328-331, 338.

⁸⁴ BAR, I, 175.

⁸⁵ Weill, *op. cit.*, 53 ff.; see also pp. 52, 96, etc.

The Egyptians sought the myrrh and electrum of Africa, the copper of Sinai, the cedar wood of Syria, and the silver of Asia Minor. But it was in domestic business and trade that their development is to be found, and there we see the same legal precision as in their contracts. The sale of a house, for example, is a legal contract, the form of which is exceedingly methodical: (1) subject of the contract, (2) description of the house, (3) the oath by the king to fulfill the contract, (4) the payment of the price, and (5) the names of the witnesses.⁸⁶

The scenes inscribed on the walls of the tombs of early Egypt, illustrating a man's future employment in the next world, really give us a good idea of what the daily life of the Egyptians in this world was. We see sowing and reaping, hunting and fishing, buying and selling, and everywhere the evidence of a happy busy people.⁸⁷

Laborers in early Egypt, as elsewhere, were of two classes; free and enslaved. Any individual short of the king may be classed as a free laborer or as a servant. Ptahshepses, of the Fifth Dynasty, prides himself on being "more honored by the king than any *servant*." ⁸⁸ All men were servants and laborers of the king. But there were also others, whose part it was to do menial work, but who were free agents. This we can assume on the basis of what we have learned about the possession of property. Any ordinary subject of the king may possess property, but a slave could not.⁸⁹

Over against the freeman was the slave.⁹⁰ His condition of slavery may have been captivity, or purchase. In early Egypt there is evidence that captives were taken and used as slaves. They are represented on many inscriptions from the very earliest times.⁹¹ In the transfer of property, slaves were included as well as cattle.⁹² They were thus acquired by purchase. In addition, the *corvée* was common in Egypt, as we learn from Debhen's inscription of the Fourth Dynasty; ⁹³ and that was equivalent to slavery.

⁸⁶ Sethe, *op. cit.*

⁸⁷ LD, II, *passim*.

⁸⁸ BAR, I, 258.

⁸⁹ Baillet, *op. cit.*, II, 559, note 7.

⁹⁰ For a discussion of the words translated "slave," see RT, 27, 30-38, 193-

217; 28, 113-131; 29, 6-25; and Baillet, *op. cit.*, II, 563 ff.

⁹¹ Petrie, *op. cit.*, 7, 22; LD, II, *passim*.

⁹² BAR, I, 171; cf. 175.

⁹³ BAR, I, 211; Weill, *op. cit.*, 27.

3. *International Virtues and Vices*

We have already had occasion to see that Egypt from the very beginning came in contact, to a certain extent, with the outside world. Her commerce and trade extended far beyond her own boundaries. Likewise the marriage relationship was sometimes extended to embrace the foreigner, for it seems that a nobleman of the Third Dynasty took a Nubian to wife, as did also a royal scribe of the Sixth Dynasty.⁹⁴

The Egyptians were a peace-loving people, a fact to which Strabo bears witness. In a series of hymns addressed to the Diadem of the pharaoh, and which have been assigned to the period previous to the Middle Kingdom, the ideal of the country is represented as decidedly peaceful (*hṯp*). The idea of peace is repeated again and again, and seems to mean not merely domestic tranquillity but peace in the widest and most general sense.⁹⁵

The early Egyptians as well as other peoples, however, had their wars. The ideal divine king of Egypt, Horus, was known as the "Smiter of Barbarians."⁹⁶ Pepi I sent Uni on a military expedition to Palestine and Phoenicia.⁹⁷ War is always cruel, and it was not an exception in this respect in early Egypt. Uni describes in his biography how the army of Pepi I, under his generalship, "had hacked up the land of the Sand-dwellers . . . destroyed the land of the Sand-dwellers . . . overturned its strongholds . . . cut down its figs and vines . . . thrown fire upon all its troops . . . slain troops therein in many thousands . . . carried away therefrom a great multitude as living captives."⁹⁸ The famous slate Palette of Nar-Mer shows the king in the act of slaying his captives, and restraining them by means of a nose-hook and rope.⁹⁹

Mercenaries were used, as in the case of Uni, who collected soldiers from Nubia to fight against the Asiatics.¹⁰⁰ The soldiery, however, were often used in times of peace for the protection of the people. The noble, Tefibi, boasts that "when night came, he who slept on

⁹⁴ Baillet, *op. cit.*, I, 201, note 1.

⁹⁵ A. Erman, *Hymnen an das Diadem der Pharaonen*, Berlin, 1911, *passim*.

⁹⁶ BAR, I, 169.

⁹⁷ BAR, I, 311 ff.

⁹⁸ BAR, I, 313.

⁹⁹ Quibell, *Hieraconpolis*, London, 1900, I, pl. 29.

¹⁰⁰ BAR, I, 311.

the road gave me praise, for he was like a man in his house, the fear of my soldiers was his protection.”¹⁰¹

Egypt's wars were holy because they were under the protection of the gods. Horus was the vanquisher of the Barbarians, and any war carried on by Egypt against a foreign power had the approval of the gods. And so it happens that on palettes and monuments, which depict warfare, the symbols of the gods always find a place.¹⁰² The enemies of Egypt are the enemies of Egypt's gods,¹⁰³ and against them war is a work of piety, and their death a consummation devoutly to be wished.

4. *Transcendental Virtues and Vices*

The early Egyptian peopled his world with gods good and bad. Everything mysterious and inexplicable to him was, or contained, a god. The most striking and mysterious phenomenon of a locality became the god of that district, and so in early Egypt each nome or district or city had its god. When the nomes united into larger districts, families of gods were formed. Thus, at Heliopolis, the centre of a confederation of districts, there grew up a family of nine gods, an Ennead, which was adopted in the whole of Egypt, because of the power and influence of Heliopolis, before the Eleventh Dynasty.

Some gods proved themselves to be good, others to be evil, and it was forbidden to obey certain gods because they were bad.¹⁰⁴ This idea of imperfection on the part of the gods belongs to the general conception of deity prevalent among the early Egyptians. According to this conception the gods were created,¹⁰⁵ and they died,¹⁰⁶ like men. Some are sinful, others are righteous,¹⁰⁷ and they experience fear just as human beings do.¹⁰⁸ In short, anthropomorphism of the grossest kind is ascribed to them.¹⁰⁹ They were the makers of all things, good and bad;¹¹⁰ they made love and hate;¹¹¹ they gave life to the free and death to the wicked;¹¹² “Atum . . .

¹⁰¹ BAR, I, 395.

¹⁰² E. g., palette of Nar-Mer, referred to above; Baillet, *op. cit.*, I, 171.

¹⁰³ Baillet, *op. cit.*, I, 177.

¹⁰⁴ PT, §§ 1588 ff.

¹⁰⁵ Erman, *Ein Denkmal*, 941.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. Osiris.

¹⁰⁷ PT, § 1556.

¹⁰⁸ Erman, *Hymnen an das Diadem*, 35 str. 12.

¹⁰⁹ PT, Ut. 273.

¹¹⁰ Erman, *Ein Denkmal*, 941 ff.

¹¹¹ Erman, *Ein Denkmal*, 940.

¹¹² Erman, *Ein Denkmal*, 940.

made that which is loved and that which is hated. It was he who gave life to the peaceful and death to the guilty.”¹¹³

But more than anything else the early Egyptian loved to think of the gods as the source of all truth, righteousness, and justice. Horus is the “lord of truth”; Rā is “the great god of truth”; Osiris is the “lord of truth”; Rā separates true from false; Rā has two barges of “truth” or “righteousness”; a god’s barge is regularly called the “barge of truth”; one god is called the “expeller of deceit”; a queen is named *Hap-n-Maāt*, “truth is of Apis”; the daughter of Rā is the goddess of truth and righteousness; and truth was personified as the goddess Maāt.¹¹⁴

Being the origin of truth, the gods are also the source of justice. Men are judged before the gods¹¹⁵ who are the very essence of justice¹¹⁶ and require just dealings.¹¹⁷

The king was the direct representative of the gods to the nation. The people were servants of the king and he in turn was a servant of the gods. The king loves the gods,¹¹⁸ and the gods help the king because they know that otherwise they would lose his support.¹¹⁹ The king is the god’s heir and is beloved by him.¹²⁰ In general, the god’s duty to the king is that of father to son, and the king’s duty to the god is that of son to father. The gods love, help, and protect the king; and the king loves, obeys, and worships the gods.

It is the state form of religion which we know best in Egypt. The Pyramid Texts were inscribed in the tombs of the kings, and the other mortuary texts and biographies belong to barons and leading men of the people. We learn a good deal about the king, his nobles, and his slaves, but we know little about the great mass of the people. It is assumed on the basis of comparative religion that the average Egyptian of the early period worshipped all kinds of inanimate and animate objects, such as trees and animals; and practised a good deal of magic. But wherever the state religion penetrated we find that the individual was conscious of his close relationship with the gods. In describing, then, the individual’s relation to his gods,

¹¹³ Erman, *Ein Denkmal*, 940.

¹¹⁴ See Pyramid Texts, *passim*, for these and other similar statements.

¹¹⁵ Erman, *Hymnen an das Diodam*, 36, str. 16.

¹¹⁶ Baillet, *op. cit.*, I, 93 ff.

¹¹⁷ PT, § 1188.

¹¹⁸ Petrie, *op. cit.*, 55; cf. such names as Mery-n-Rā of the Sixth Dynasty.

¹¹⁹ PT, Ut. 539.

¹²⁰ E. g., PT, § 787.

we shall use the extant evidence as applicable not only to the noble but also to the average Egyptian who had become conscious of the national cult.

The early nomarchs loved to boast of the honor paid them by their city-gods,¹²¹ and of the way in which the gods loved them.¹²² Their greatest desire was to do the will of the gods,¹²³ and to be praised by them.¹²⁴ Blasphemy was always condemned,¹²⁵ and most severely and savagely punished.¹²⁶

The gods were the natural protectors of the individual, who brought his complaints before them for rectification. Henku, of the Fifth Dynasty, said: "I never oppressed one in possession of his property, so that he complained of me because of it to the god of my city,"¹²⁷ and thereby shows his respect for the individual's right to appeal to the gods.

Gods and goddesses are the objects of worship in ancient Egypt. Deities were personified material phenomena, or animals; but they were likewise deified human beings. The king was worshipped as a deity and so was the mother of the king.¹²⁸ The gods were the ancestors of the race, and their immediate descendants, the royalty, were treated as gods.

The chief religious official was the pharaoh. He stood at the head of the hierarchy. Priests were merely his representatives. He was really the priesthood in himself, and so the stereotyped phrase for making an offering by whomsoever made is *hṯp dy nī swt* "an offering which the king makes."

But as the king could not be present everywhere at all times, an official priesthood represented him. There were chief priests, ordinary priests (*wāb*, or *ḥm-nīr*), of whom there were various classes, and priestesses (*dwat-nīr*). The local noble was chief priest. The priesthood was protected and could not be drafted for forced labor,¹²⁹ and they had specific rights which could not be alienated.¹³⁰

The god always had his house (*ḥ-t nīr*) which was erected and served by the king, and in which his statue was kept. He was wor-

¹²¹ BAR, I, 281, 378.

¹²² BAR, I, 240.

¹²³ BAR, I, 262.

¹²⁴ BAR, I, 413.

¹²⁵ PT, Ut. 467.

¹²⁶ PT, § 962 f.; cf. ZAS, 35, 7-11.

¹²⁷ BAR, I, 281.

¹²⁸ Weill, *op. cit.*, 93.

¹²⁹ BAR, I, 227.

¹³⁰ BAR, I, 205 ff.

shipped by sacrifices, offerings, praise, and prayer.¹³¹ Even human sacrifice seems to have been practised in ancient Egypt.¹³² Great festivals were held in which the great deeds of the gods were demonstrated and when offerings and prayers were made.¹³³

That a great deal of the religion of ancient Egypt was ceremonial is to be expected. The purifications so often spoken of in the Pyramid Texts are as a rule to be interpreted in a ceremonial way. The commonest name for priest, namely, *wab*, means clean; and undoubtedly had a ceremonial origin. Nor was magic absent. The numerous incantations, which became so common in later times, are means whereby the action of the gods are thought to be controlled and regulated, and the idea underlying an offering was commonly magical. The gods must help, otherwise offerings will not be made, and conversely, an offering is made to force help from the gods.¹³⁴ There are cases where perhaps the idea of cleansing was understood in a real spiritual and moral way,¹³⁵ but the general conception was physical and ceremonial.

The early Egyptian was not adverse to proselytism, for we learn that Harkhuf, of the Sixth Dynasty, after having pacified the enemy, caused him to praise all the gods for the king's sake.¹³⁶

5. *Personal Virtues and Vices*

Although the average ancient Egyptian does not find a very large place, as stated above, in our extant literature, yet we may be sure he had his individual rights of which he was proud. A citizen, probably of the middle class, in the Fifth Dynasty is found to have made the following proud assertion: "Never was I beaten in the presence of any official since my birth."¹³⁷ This would lead us to believe that the average citizen of early Egypt was as virile as the nobles with whose sturdy looking statues we are familiar.

The early Egyptian individual was proud of his acts of kindness. It may be called conceit, and there may have been some selfish motives back of it (cf. BAR, I, 331), but a man may well be excused for boasting of so much clemency and good as that of which the early

¹³¹ Baillet, *op. cit.*, I, 69 ff.

¹³² PRT, ii, pl. 3, Nos. 4, 6.

¹³³ PRT, i, pl. 8, Nos. 6, 7; RT, 4, 45.

¹³⁴ Cf. PT, Ut. 539.

¹³⁵ Perhaps, PT, § 921.

¹³⁶ BAR, I, 335.

¹³⁷ BAR, I, 279.

Egyptian official was capable. We read again and again such expressions as the following: "I was he who fulfilled his duty," "Never did I do anything evil towards any person," "I was one saying good things and repeating what was loved," "Never have I taken a thing belonging to any person," "Never have I done aught of violence towards any person, I gave bread to all the hungry," "I clothed him who was naked therein," "I satisfied the wolves of the mountains and the fowls of heaven," "I love that which is good and hate that which is evil," "I judged brothers to their reconciling," "I heard the word of him whose throat was contracted with fear," "I cured the wandering of the oppressed," "I saved the weak from the hand of the strong," "I held forth justice to the just," "I was not drunken," etc. For these things he was honored by his king and loved by the gods. But for those who did evil, a judgment was reserved.¹³⁸

The individual Egyptian was fortunate in a physical environment which at a very early period developed in him a belief in, and a dependence upon, a future life. This belief reacted upon his daily life. He tried to live in such a way here as to be assured of a comfortable future.¹³⁹

III. ESTIMATION OF EARLY EGYPTIAN MORALS

1. *Introduction*

In making an estimate of early Egyptian morals, care must be taken to differentiate individual from national responsibility. The standard of judgment in our estimate must necessarily be the morals of our own day. In comparing, then, the morals of early Egypt with those of our own modern Western civilization we may commend or condemn them according as they were equal or better, on the one hand; or as they were lower, on the other. But we cannot thus estimate the morals of the early Egyptian individual. He must be commended or condemned not on the basis of our code of morals, but on the basis of the morals of his own nation and times. In other words, the individual Egyptian must be examined in the light of his own civilization. There is, of course, a sense in which this is likewise true of the nation. We may say that the morals of

¹³⁸ Cf. BAR, I, *passim*.

¹³⁹ BAR, I, pp. 181 ff.

any nation should be examined in the light of the general civilization of its times. Nevertheless it is permissible and legitimate for comparative purposes to commend or condemn its morals as a nation in comparison with any other independent standard.

Further, in our study of the morals of early Egypt either in a national or in an individual way, we must bear in mind their moral determinants. This will involve a consideration of such ideas as heredity, environment, social tradition, and personal initiative. For example, in considering a perverted sense of truth or a keen sense of justice, the force of heredity must be allowed for; the force of environment should be allowed for in the case of sexual morality or immorality; that of social tradition should be allowed for in the case of monogamy or slavery; and personal rights of all kinds should be considered in the light of personal initiative.

The morals of a people can best be discovered by examining their moral ideals, their sense of moral evil, their consciousness of the presence or absence of free will, and the sanctions of their moral acts.

2. *Moral Ideals*

The early Egyptians ascribed the best they knew to their gods. Hence, if we know the character of the acts ascribed to the Egyptians' gods, we shall know what their moral ideals were.

We have learned that the early Egyptian ascribed to the gods, primarily, the attributes of love, goodness, righteousness, truth, and justice. But what was his idea of "love," "goodness," etc.? Did these words connote to the early Egyptians what they do to us? What was their moral content? So far as we can learn from a study of the original words, *maāt* is the name of the most important of Egypt's goddesses, the daughter of Rā. Her symbol is the feather, which appears in judgment scenes weighed in the balance against the heart of the deceased. The goddess is represented sometimes with bandages over her eyes. It is evident from the part played by the feather in judgment scenes that it represents the standard of judgment. Hence, it has been rendered by the words "law," "order," "duty." The blindfolded goddess represents impartiality, and hence *maāt* has been rendered by the words "truth," "justice." Moreover, the ideal of all Egyptian gods and kings was *ānh n maāt*, "living according to rule, or in justice." The hall of the kingdom

of the dead was called "the hall of the two truths." The expression is a very old one, indicating that the early Egyptian believed in the existence of two truths, whereby a matter was looked at from both sides. The form of the original word is dual.¹⁴⁰ The word *maāt* comes from the verb *maā*, "to be real," "genuine," "true." The same word appears in Coptic as ME:MHI. A common divine and royal title was *neb maāt*, "lord of truth." The word is used in conjunction with *hrw*, *maā-hrw*, meaning, "true of voice, the φωνή ἀληθής of Plutarch, or, "justified." The phrase referred to one, whether god or man, who had been found worthy, whether in this world or the next.¹⁴¹ It was sometimes used in a ceremonial way, but at the same time it connoted to the early Egyptian about what the words "truth," "justice," etc., connote to us, e. g., it would be considered unjust and cruel if a citizen were smitten beside his wife or a child smitten beside its mother;¹⁴² it was unjust to speak untruthfully.¹⁴³ The early Egyptian believed that justice "was born before strife of voice, blasphemy, and conflict arose;"¹⁴⁴ and that sky and earth were glad when justice was done.¹⁴⁵ He believed his god to be nationally just, that is, impartial as far as his people were concerned. The pharaoh was the god's true representative, and each man's virtue was a reflection of the justice of the pharaoh.

The word *nfr*, written with a sign which resembles a small musical instrument, meant originally that which is pleasing. But there is no reason to doubt that, in the time of the Old Kingdom, it had, as well, a moral connotation. For example, the nomarch Henku of the Fifth Dynasty, causes those who pass by his tomb to be addressed thus: "O all ye people of the Cerastes-Mountain; O ye great lords of other nomes, who will pass by this tomb, I, Henku, tell good things." Then, he goes on to relate the "good things." He says:

¹⁴⁰ K. Sethe, *Urkunden des Aegyptischen Altertums*, Leipzig, 1914, iv, 116, and note 1. Cf. the word for "right," *mtr*, which is written with a double determinative, two figures, denoting opposition, and the two sides of a thing. The word comes from the root *mtr*, which means "to witness."

¹⁴¹ See for discussion of the phrase: Baillet, *op. cit.*, *Introduction*, 83 ff.; *Bib.*

Eg. I, 106-109; A. Moret, *Le Rituel du Culte divin Journalier*, Paris, 1902, 161 ff.; E. Amélineau, *L'Evolution Historiques et Philos. des Idées Morales*, Paris, 1895, 8, note 1.

¹⁴² BAR, I, 404.

¹⁴³ BAR, I, 281.

¹⁴⁴ PT, § 1463.

¹⁴⁵ PT, §§ 1774a-1776b.

"I give bread to all the hungry . . . I clothed him who was naked . . . I never oppressed one in possession of his property . . . I spake and told that which was good, never was there one fearing because of one stronger than he . . . I speak no lie, for I was one beloved of his father, praised of his mother, excellent in character to his brother, and amiable to his sister."¹⁴⁶ The definition of "good," here, is sufficient for any moralist.

A clear distinction was made between "good" and "evil." The word for evil, *dwt*, is written with the sign for a mountain, the probable idea being that "evil" is associated with a more or less mysterious and fearful place, the home of evil gods. "Evil" is that which a bad god does, and is that which a bad man does. The many protests against having said "aught evil,"¹⁴⁷ and their associations with deeds such as those described in the preceding paragraph are eloquent of the content of the Egyptian word *dwt*. Moreover, there is another word which is translated "bad," namely, *wsf*, but which is usually used in a physical and ceremonial sense. The word *dwt* was sometimes used in a ceremonial way, but there is no doubt about its moral connotation.

The gods are the source not only of good and evil, but also of "that which is loved and that which is hated."¹⁴⁸ The word *mry*, to love, is contrasted with *msdy*, to hate, in the same connection as the word *hṯp*, peace, is contrasted with *hbn*, guilt.¹⁴⁹ The content of the Egyptian word *mry*, because of its association with "good,"¹⁵⁰ and its contrast with "hate," may truly be said to be a moral one.

Trusting to the accuracy of the above interpretation of these Egyptian words, we find that family love, in early Egypt, being moral, and being, as we have seen above, the family ideal, was the moral ideal of Egyptian family life. The social ideal, in early Egypt, is expressed by the words "good," "right," and "just." Generosity, kindness, goodness,¹⁵¹ even to animals,¹⁵² and truthfulness, were the admiration of the early Egyptian. Kheti II, an early nomarch, said: "When the land was in need I maintained the city . . . I allowed the citizen to carry away for himself grain; and his wife, the

¹⁴⁶ BAR, I, 281; cf. 328-331, etc.

¹⁵⁰ BAR, I, 328-331, 357, etc.

¹⁴⁷ BAR, I, 331, 240; PT, § 1238.

¹⁵¹ BAR, I, 281, 328-331, 408.

¹⁴⁸ Erman, *Ein Denkmal*, 940.

¹⁵² BAR, I, 408.

¹⁴⁹ Erman, *Ein Denkmal*, 140.

widow and her son. I remitted all imposts which I found counted by my fathers . . . I was kind to the cow.¹⁵³ . . . Justice, both legal and commercial, was demanded and democratic ideas were beginning to develop. And the ideal was a moral one as we have seen by our study of the connotation of "good," "right," and "just." The international ideal was peace, and, being the ideal of a peace-loving people, it was a moral ideal. The transcendental ideal was truth, justice, love, and obedience. The gods were the source and fountain of truth and justice, they were models of righteousness, and they were loved and obeyed. That they were feared, we may assume; that ceremony and pure magic played a great rôle in early Egyptian life there is no question; and that love and obedience often were the result of fear, we have no reason to doubt; but that the gods were the champions of justice and objects of love and obedience, we have much reason to believe. The ideal was unquestionably moral. The personal ideal was to be pleasing to one's family and friends, and its moral quality is revealed by the association therewith of excellence of character.¹⁵⁴

3. *Moral Evil*

The word for evil, discussed above, namely, *dwt*, must be distinguished from another word which is usually translated "evil," namely, *mr-t*, but which, in reality, means "sickness" or "evil" in the sense of physical suffering.¹⁵⁵ The former word, like the word, *bta*, which means "evil" in the sense of "crime," is used in a moral sense. In the inscriptions of Siut, it is said: "the wicked saw it, . . . he put not eternity before him, he looked not to the future, he saw evil (*bta*)."¹⁵⁶ This "evil" the early Egyptian opposed and hated. Again and again, in the Pyramid Texts, one protests against the imputation of "evil" to him, and recommends the avoidance of "evil."¹⁵⁷

Another word for "evil" or "bad" is *byn*. Its determinative would rather indicate "meanness." The same is true of the word for "lie," namely, *grg*, as well as for the general word for "sin," namely, *ysf-t*. The fundamental idea being that sin in general, in-

¹⁵³ BAR, I, 408. ¹⁵⁴ BAR, I, 281.

¹⁵⁵ PT, § 1699, where the physical injury of Horus caused by his brother Seth is referred to. Cf. PT, UT. 606, etc.

¹⁵⁶ Griffith, *The Inscriptions of Siut*, London, 1889, pl. 12, 1, 39; BAR, I, 397.

¹⁵⁷ PT, § 722.

cluding badness and lying, is small, little, mean. The determinative is a small bird, a sparrow.

The early Egyptian considered moral evil, in general, to consist in the doing of wrong and in lying. In his family life these defects were barred as thoroughly as possible. In social life injustice was considered the greatest moral evil. But harsh and needlessly severe punishments were tolerated.¹⁵⁸ In international relations war was undesirable although not reckoned evil. In transcendental affairs impiety was the moral evil, although anthropomorphism, magic, and human sacrifice were customary and legal, and therefore not considered morally evil. In personal relations impiety and cruelty were especially condemned.

The ancient Egyptians had no theory of the origin of evil other than that evil as well as everything else came from the gods, who created evil as well as good.

4. *Free Will*

In early Egyptian literature there is no evidence that the Egyptians speculated about free will and predestination. It would seem that their anthropomorphism and Emperor-worship were too real to allow room for any predestination ideas. The gods were not far-off beings, who, at the beginning of things, determined destinies, but they were ever present, super-human, beings, who lived and moved in the present. Man's destinies were in the hands of the gods, but they were being shaped in the present. It would seem, therefore, that the early Egyptians believed in the reality of a freedom of the will. Their many exhortations to avoid evil and do good show that they believed in the power of making decisions, in changing courses of action, and in entering upon new experiences. There was, therefore, probably no mental conflict about the question of the compatibility or incompatibility of free will and predestination. They believed that the gods created evil as well as good, but they continually boasted of having themselves avoided the one and encompassed the other.

5. *Moral Sanctions*

Moral sanctions may be external or internal. External moral sanctions are low, internal moral sanctions are high. In other words,

¹⁵⁸ Weill, *op. cit.*, 35.

external sanctions are not "moral," while internal ones are. An external sanction for an action is utilitarian only and has reference, primarily, to individual comfort and advantage. If a good deed is done because of public opinion, or in order to be the object of a corresponding good deed, or to avoid punishment, or to be revered by posterity, or to enjoy a good burial, or even to gain the assurance of prosperity in the next world, it is an external sanction and cannot be called "morally" good. The early Egyptian had an unshakeable faith in the future. The resurrection, and immortality of Osiris were looked upon as a kind of assurance of the resurrection and immortality of every individual. But his idea of the future was that of an existence in the sky (Pyramid Texts) where life would be somewhat as it was in this world. His desire was that it might go well with him in the presence of the great god just as in this life.¹⁵⁹ There he would live for ever.¹⁶⁰

On the other hand, an internal sanction for an action is moral. An internal sanction is the joy and pleasure of doing what is right; the doing of what was pleasing to the gods and to men. If this be so, the ancient Egyptians figured on "moral" sanctions in action. He loved to assert that he was a "doer of that which pleased all men";¹⁶¹ he believed that he would be justified by his good deeds,¹⁶² and that his worthiness was deemed valuable in the sight of the gods;¹⁶³ he was confident that the wicked would not stand the moral test which awaited those who passed into the next world;¹⁶⁴ and that even the gods must "be justified before Geb."¹⁶⁵ In short, the early Egyptian considered the triumph of the righteous cause of Horus over Seth as typical of the triumph of right over wrong in individual life, and that the doing of good and justice was a joy forever. In his own way, he believed that life depended upon character here as well as in the future, where righteousness would be built.¹⁶⁶ The ferryman to the great beyond would receive only those of whom it could be said "there is no evil which he has done."¹⁶⁷

¹⁵⁹ BAR, I, 328-331, etc.

¹⁶⁰ PT, § 1471.

¹⁶¹ BAR, I, 279.

¹⁶² PT, §§ 316-318.

¹⁶³ BAR, I, 328-331.

¹⁶⁴ BAR, I, 328-331.

¹⁶⁵ PT, § 1327.

¹⁶⁶ PT, § 815.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. ZAS, 31, 76-77; PT, § 1238.

6. *Conclusion*

To sum up, it will be well to review the main features of Early Egyptian morals, and to make an estimate of them. In making this estimate we must carefully distinguish between the nation and the individual. Our standard in judging the nation must be the morals of our own time, but the individual must be judged in the light of the customs and laws of ancient Egypt.

In our study of the customs and laws of the ancient Egyptians as a nation we have noticed certain defects. Their idea of God was a very anthropomorphic one. Their gods were created and died; they married and suffered, and they intrigued and were coerced, just like human beings. They accepted human sacrifices, and magic words could control them; and they were local and national. The punishment for blasphemy was excessive. In family life, polygamy was permissible, and concubinage was common; in social life, punishments were very severe and slavery and forced labor were legal; and in international affairs, cruelty to captives was common.

On the other hand, we have learned how devoted the early Egyptians were to their gods and how sure they were of the love, righteousness, truth, and justice of the gods. The fundamental principle in family life was equality and love, in social relationship, justice and kindness were always admired and encouraged, and the growth of a real spirit of democracy is noticeable; in international affairs, the ideal was peaceful trade, and in personal life goodness was at a premium.

The moral ideals of the early Egyptians were: love and equality in family affairs; truth, goodness, and justice in social relationship; peace in international affairs; reverence, love and obedience in transcendental life; and goodness in personal relationship. These were ideals, which were, however, not always attained. Moral evil was considered to be the opposite of these ideals; and a man possessed the power of choosing good or bad without being predestined to either. Sanction for right conduct was really "moral," although external or utilitarian motives were not absent.

The individual Egyptian judged in the light of his own time and controlled by heredity, environment, and social tradition, has impressed us as a person singularly devoted to his gods and to his

family within the limited sphere of his ideals; generous and just to his fellow-men, although recognizing slavery and forced labor as legal institutions; peace-loving, and capable of being appealed to by lofty and unselfish ideals.

Finally, we have learned the early Egyptians to have been, as a people, devoted to goodness, truth, and justice, though laboring under the limitations of their time. Their civilization was remarkably high, though limited by imperfect customs, such as polygamy, slavery, forced labor, excessive cruelty, and unworthy ideas of divinity. But there is nothing to show that the early Egyptian, as an individual, controlled by the customs and ideas of his time, was lacking in the conception of moral principles. On the contrary, considering the limitations of his time, he cannot be too highly praised.

A SURVEY OF ASSYRIOLOGY DURING THE YEARS

1915-1917

By JOHN A. MAYNARD, New York City¹

A COMPARISON of our survey with similar articles written in time of peace shows the paralyzing influence of war on general culture. The blockade of Germany and our rupture with that country has prevented us from being in touch with much that was produced by German scholars. We have noticed only reviews that contributed some new scientific material.

We have classified books and articles that have reached us under various headings: Bibliography, 1-2; Explorations, 3-5; Texts, 7-13; Languages cognate (?) to Sumerian, 14-17; Signs, 18-21; Lexicography, 22-61; Sumerian Grammar, 62-70; Akkadian Grammar, 71-72; Geography, 73-79; Chronology, 80-85; History, 86-128; Law, 129-153; Business documents, 154-183; Letters, 184-202; Civilization, 203-215; Names, 216-222; Nature, 223-225, Literature, 225, Myths and Religious texts, 226-278, Religion, 279-314, Divination, 315-323, Astronomy, 324-328, Calendar, 329-331, Field-Surveys, 332-334, Mathematics, 335-339, Art, 340-347, Cylinders, 348-351, Music, 352, Medicine, 353-355, Babel and Bible, 356-364.

(1) The BIBLIOGRAPHY of G. C. Teleri (*Assiro-babilonese e studi affini*, RSO, VII, 1915, p. 089-0167) stops with the year 1915. No other bibliography was published since the war began with the exception of (2) *Zu H. Wincklers Gedächtnis nebst Wincklers Bibliographie*, MVAG, XX, 1.)

¹ Less common abbreviations: n. s. not seen; AE, *Ancient Egypt*; AF, *Assyriologische Forschungen*; AJA, *American Journal of Archaeology*; AJTh, *American Journal of Theology*; CR, *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres*; DLZ, *Deutsche Literatur Zeitung*; ERE, *Hastings' Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*; ET, *Expository Times*; GGA, *Göttingischer Gelehrte Anzeigen*; JQR, *Jewish Quarterly Review*; JSOR, *Journal of the Society of Oriental Research*; LZB, *Literatur Zentral Blatt*; MJ, *Museum Journal* (of the Univ. of Pennsylvania); PBS, *Publications of the Babylonian Section of the Museum of the Univ. of Pennsylvania*; RC, *Revue Critique*; RSO, *Rivista d. Studi Orientali*; RTP, *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*; TL, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*; WZKM, *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*.

(3, 4, 5) M. Pillet studied records of the expedition of Place in CR, 1916²²⁴⁻²⁴⁰; *Revue archéologique*, IV (1916)²³⁰⁻²⁴¹; RA, XIV (1917)⁹⁷⁻¹²⁰. (Cf. also 199.)

(7) MISCELLANEOUS TEXTS were published by A. T. Clay, *Miscellaneous Inscriptions in the Yale Babylonian Collection*, 1915. Cf. reviews by (8) T. G. Pinches, JRAS 1916⁵⁹³⁻⁵⁹⁸; (9) S. Langdon, RA 13 (1916)¹⁵⁹⁻¹⁶⁴; (10) A. H. Sayce, ET 27⁵²²⁻⁵²³; (11) L. Waterman, AJTH 21¹²³⁻¹²⁵; (12) D. D. Luckenbill, AJSL 34⁷¹⁻⁷². Also by (13) Scheil, *Notules*, RA 1917, 14⁸⁷⁻⁹⁴. In the course of this survey we refer to other new texts edited by Allotte de la Fuye (334), Barton (154), Bedale (169), Chiera (217, 219), Contenau (165, 167, 168), Ebeling (226), Geller (241), Hussey (159, 173), King (104), Langdon (22, 23, 24, 25, 32, 63, 64, 65, 229, 231, 239, 342, 261, 322, 323), Luckenbill (26, 184, 185, 192), Margolis (160), Meek (161), Meissner (30), Nies (99), Nikolsky (171), Pinches (128, 162, 177, 178, 181, 288), Scheil (27, 28, 82, 106, 175, 176, 180, 182, 287, 306, 307, 337, 351, 353, 354), Schroeder (191), Ungnad (187, 190) and Vanderburgh (200).

(14) C. J. Ball's book on *Chinese and Sumerian* (1913) was criticized by (15) L. C. Hopkins, *Chinese and Sumerian*, PSBA 1914²⁶⁹⁻²⁷³, 1915²⁴⁻³³; 50-59; 75-86 on the grounds that the Chinese characters compared by Ball to Sumerian words were late both as to shape and pronunciation. (16) F. Hommel studied the analogy of Sumerian and the Turanian languages in a *Systematisches Vergleich des Sumerischen mit der Turanischen Sprachgruppe*, 1915. Cf. OLZ 1915²⁸¹. (17) M. Tseretheli who had begun in 1914 a comparison of *Sumerian and Georgian* brought it to a conclusion in JRAS 1915²⁵⁵⁻²⁸⁸ and 1916¹⁻⁵⁸.

No systematic work on the SIGNS has appeared. (18) *The sign aragub-minnabi* was studied by Langdon, AJSL XXXI²⁸²⁻²⁸³. (19) Poebel wrote on the value *û* of the sign *ud*, OLZ 1915⁷⁵⁻⁷⁸; (20) W. Foertsch on the value *dur* of the sign *PA*, OLZ 1915³⁷⁰. (21) A review of M. Streck, *Silben- und Ideogrammliste* in VAB was given by W. Foertsch, OLZ 1915²⁷⁵⁻²⁷⁷.

LEXICOGRAPHY is of course of primary importance. Much has been written on the (so-called) SYLLABARIES. The *Yale syllabary* published by Clay (Cf. 7) has been discussed by Pinches (Cf. 8), Langdon (Cf. 9), Luckenbill (Cf. 12). Langdon published the Sum-

erian originals of syllabar B and of the series *ana itti-šu* in his (22) *Sumerian Grammatical texts*, PBS XII, No. 1. The reëdited lexicographical material in (23) RA, 1917, 14⁷⁵⁻⁸⁶ and (24) published a new *Syllabar in the (New-York) Metropolitan Museum*, JSOR I¹⁹⁻²³ and (25) *The neo-Babylonian Syllabar* 34950, PSBA 38⁵⁸⁻⁵⁹. (26) D. D. Luckenbill edited the *Chicago syllabary*, AJSL 1917, 33¹⁶⁹⁻¹⁹⁹. (27) V. Scheil gave us a syllabar of Constantinople, RA 1916, 13¹³⁵⁻¹³⁷ and (28) a school-boy's tablet with vocabulary, *ditto*¹³⁷⁻¹³⁸. The series *gar-ra* = *hubullum* was studied by (29) C. H. W. Johns, AJSL 34⁵⁹⁻⁶⁶, and the fifth tablet of that series edited by (30) Meissner, *Assyriologische Forschungen*, 1916¹⁸⁻⁴³. (31) Meissner showed (OLZ 1915¹³⁶⁻¹³⁸) that Poebel PBS, V, No. 133 and 134 are new duplicates of the third tablet of that series and contains terms relating to the date palm. (32) The *list of plants* K 9182 was given by Langdon in RA 1916, 13³³⁻³⁴. (33) Langdon gave also *lexicographical and epigraphical notes* in RA 1916, 13¹⁻⁴. (34) Holma contributed some *Etudes sur les vocabulaires sumériens-accadiens-hittites de Delitzsch* in the *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, 23 (1916), (n. s.). (35) W. Foertsch shows that KŪ means *bringen, liefern* OLZ 1915³⁹⁻⁴² and (36) that *zid-utū* means like *zid-gaz, zerstossenes Mehl*. (OLZ 1915²³⁰⁻²³¹). A note on the Sumerian *tu*, *dove*, and *nam*, *swallow*, was contributed by (37) P. Haupt, JSOR I³⁻⁹. (38) O. Schroeder showed that the Sumerians used parchment and that the scribe who wrote on this material was called *kuš-sar* (in Akkadian, *kuššarru*), ZA 30⁹¹⁻⁹². (39) G. Boson published in RSO 1916, 7³⁷⁹⁻⁴²⁰, a most valuable study on *I metallo e le pietre nelle iscrizioni sumero-assiro-babilonesi*. Numerous notes on Assyrian lexicography were published. We shall mention (40) a note on *parzillu*, *iron*, by Peiser, OLZ 1915⁶⁻⁷; (41) a note on *kusarikku*, *goat-fish*, by Langdon AJSL 31²⁸³⁻²⁸⁵; (42) a note on *sihlu*, *ditto*²⁸⁵⁻²⁸⁶, by the same; (43) a note on *mušlalu*, *Mittag*, by Landsberger, OLZ 1916³⁶⁻³⁹; (44) a note on ^{lu}ŠīgarM, ^{amel}*bappirātu*, by Schroeder, OLZ 1916⁴⁰⁻⁴¹; (45) a note on *habu*, *amphora*, by Haupt, OLZ 1915²⁹⁶⁻²⁹⁷; (46) note on the Assyrian *ramku*, AJSL 32⁶⁴⁻⁷⁵; (47) on *irrū*, *Mohn*, ZA 30⁶⁰⁻⁶⁶; (48) on *tuppu*, *warten, aufziehen*, ZA 30⁹⁶⁻⁹⁹; (49) on *šutammu*, *Siegelstecher*, ZA 30⁹⁹⁻¹⁰⁰; (50) on *mur-nisgi*, *war-horse*, AJSL 33⁴⁵⁻⁴⁸; (51) on *kalmat*, *louse*, JAOS 36⁴¹⁶⁻⁴¹⁸; (52) on *lānu*, *aspect*, JAOS 37²⁵³⁻²⁵⁵, by the same scholar. (53) Ungnad showed that ŠU-

GE-tum was pronounced šanitum and meant literally the second wife. (54) Langdon wrote a note on *nasbaṭu*, *samaru* in PSBA 38³⁸⁻⁴⁰. (55) Some Babylonian etymologies were discussed by H. Bauer, ZA 30¹⁰⁶⁻¹⁰⁹, and (56) by Meissner, AF 1916, I⁴⁴⁻⁵³. (57) A. H. Godbey wrote a note on the *rab-šitirte*, AJSL 34¹³⁻²⁰; (58) A. T. Clay studied the root *nazālu* (akin to *nazazu*), OLZ 1915¹⁷⁶⁻¹⁷⁷, and (59) Ungnad the root SA₁R akin to SPN, cover, OLZ 1915²⁰⁰⁻²⁰¹. (60) O. Schroeder showed how *belat* in old-assyrian became *belit*, owing to Babylonian influences, OLZ 1915²⁶⁶. (61) C. Bezold has given us the first materials for a new Akkadian lexicon in the Sitzber. d. philos. histor. Klasse d. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wissens. 1915, 8 (*Historische Keilschrifttexte aus Assur, Zettelproben des babylonisch-assyrisch Woerterbuchs der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften*).

Important material for the SUMERIAN GRAMMAR has been given by Langdon in his *Sumerian Grammatical texts* already mentioned (Cf. No. 22). Cf. a review by (62) S. A. B. Mercer, JSOR I⁹⁶. Langdon has edited other texts bearing on this subject in his *Assyrian grammatical texts* (63) RA 13⁹¹⁻⁹⁸, a new edition of a well-known text on the Sumerian verb; (64) RA 13¹⁸¹⁻¹⁹², and (65) RA 14, No. 1, both texts relating to the series *ana itti-šu* (Cf. No. 23). (66) Langdon wrote on the (conditional) *particle man* in PSBA 38³⁷⁻³⁸, and (67) J. D. Prince on the *pronouns and the verbs of Sumerian*, in Proceed. of Amer. Philos. Society, 1915, 54²⁷⁻⁴⁶. Valuable reviews of Delitzsch's Sumerian Grammar were written by (68) Hoschander, JQR V⁶⁴²⁻⁶⁴⁵ (69) Weissbach, DLZ 1915⁹¹³⁻⁹²², and (70) Prince, AJSL 31¹⁵⁹⁻¹⁶⁷.

Little was done on AKKADIAN GRAMMAR. H. Bauer book on the Semitic Tenses was reviewed by (71) Poebel, OLZ 1916²³⁻²⁸; ⁴⁶⁻⁵². (72) *The etymology of the Babylonian relative pronoun* was studied by Langdon, AJSL 31²⁷¹⁻²⁸¹.

Our knowledge of the GEOGRAPHY of Babylonia is often improved by the books on history mentioned below. Short articles were written by (73) A. H. Sayce on *the land of Nod* = NI-DU, the end of the world = Dilmun, PSBA 38⁶⁻¹⁰; (74) by the same in ET 27¹³⁶⁻¹³⁸. (75) J. B. Nies showed that GIŠ-UH^{ki} or GIŠ-ĤU^{ki} is Umma, JAOS 37²⁵⁵⁻²⁵⁸; (76) Landsberger that UH^{ki} = Akšak = Upi, OLZ 19³⁴⁻³⁶. Cf. Unger and Weissbach, ZA 29¹⁸⁵. (77) P. Haupt showed that the land of *Ub* or *Ab*, near Damascus, according

to the Amarna Letters, literally means forest. (78) A. H. Sayce contributed geographical informations on the *Northern Campaigns of Sargon of Akkad*, PSBA 38²⁰¹, (79) as well as E. F. Kraeling in *Aram and Israel*. (Cf. also Nos. 95, 117.)

In the field of CHRONOLOGY (80) D. Sidersky, following on the steps of Strassmeier and Kugler took position against the pan-babylonian school in his *Etude sur la chronologie assyro-babylonienne* (1916). (81) C. H. W. Johns wrote on the problem of *The dynasty of Gutium*, PSBA 38¹⁹⁹⁻²⁰⁰, in the light of the new elements brought forth by Clay (Cf. No. 7). Scheil contributed (82) a *notule*, RA 12¹⁹⁹, giving some dates of Rim-Sin's reign. (83) B. Landsberger, OLZ 19³³⁻³⁴, harmonized the names of the 8th year of Hammurabi in King's List with that of Scheil (La chronologie rectifiée du règne de Hammourabi) by reading ^{id} BAD-DAR as ^{id} Sumundar. (84) E. Unger wrote *Zu den Beamtenstelen von Assur*, ZA 30⁷⁴⁻⁷⁸, and (85) C. H. W. Johns some *Notes on the Chronology of the Neo-Babylonian Empire*, PSBA 38¹⁴⁶⁻¹⁴⁸. (Cf. also No. 126.)

The field of HISTORY is very popular. A. T. Olmstead is one of the few Assyriologists who have had a thorough historical training. In his (86) *Assyrian historiography* (1916) he has sounded a war-cry against uncritical methods and made a brilliant sifting of sources. There is a good review of that pamphlet by (87) R. W. Rogers AJTh 21 (1917)²⁹⁶⁻²⁹⁷. Rogers published (88) in 1915 a sixth edition of his *History of Babylonia and Assyria*. (89) L. W. King gave us a remarkable volume on the *History of Babylon* (1915) a continuation of his *Sumer and Akkad*. (90) A. T. Olmstead criticized it with some asperity in AJTh 20²⁷⁷⁻²⁸⁶. (91) Cf. another review by Luckenbill, AJSL 33²⁵⁰⁻²⁵². (92) Delitzsch's article *Zu Herodots babylonischen Nachrichten*, Sachau's Festschrift, (1915)⁸⁷⁻¹⁰², brings us back to a somewhat neglected source. In the February number of the National Geographic magazine, 1916, were two very good popular articles by (93) J. Baikie on *the Cradle of Civilization* and by (94) A. T. Clay on *Pushing back history's horizon*. (95) A. T. Olmstead's article on *the political development of Early Babylonia*, AJSL 33²⁸³⁻³²¹, is a marvel of clearness. The outline of Babylonian geography given there is the best ever written; the treatment of the prehistoric kings is excellent. The article carries us to the invasion of the barbarian Gutium. (96) A. H. Sayce wrote on the mythical rulers of Babylonia

in his *Two early babylonian legends*, PSBA 37¹⁹⁵⁻²⁰⁰. (97) C. van Gelderen (*Zum assyrischen Koenigstitel šar kissati*, OLZ 1915²⁶⁵, connected the title *šar kiššati* with king of Kish. (98) Scheil wrote on *l'archiviste-roi An-àm*, RA 12¹⁹³. (99) J. B. Nies wrote on *a net cylinder of Entemena*, JAOS 36¹³⁷⁻¹³⁹, and (100) in *Art and Archaeology*, Feb., 1917¹⁰⁴⁻¹⁰⁶. A fragment of a basalt vase of the same king was published (101) by O. Weber in *Amtliche Berichte aus den Koeniglichen Kunstsammlungen*, 36¹¹⁴⁻¹²⁰ (n. s.). (102) A statuette of Lugal-kisal-si now in Berlin was reproduced and described by Weber in the same publication (Jan. 1915). Cf. also AJA 1916⁹⁸⁻⁹⁹. (103) G. S. Duncan worked some texts in *The Sumerian Inscriptions of Sin-Gašid*, AJSL 31²¹⁵⁻²²¹. (104) L. W. King gave us two tablets of that ruler in his *Foundation-inscriptions from the royal palace at Erech*, PSBA 37²²⁻²³. Clay's book already mentioned (Cf. No. 7) raised up again the question of Warad-sin and Arioch. (105) Cf. T. G. Pinches, PSBA 39^{4-15 55-75}. (106) Scheil in a *Notule*, RA 12¹¹⁴⁻¹¹⁵, showed that there were Habiri in the time of Rim-Sin. (107) P. M. Witzel took up *Die Einleitungszeilen zu Gudea Zylinder A*, OLZ 1915³⁶¹⁻³⁶⁷, and retranslated the first twelve lines.

(108) A. H. Sayce referred to the mythical history of Sargon in the Amarna texts in his article on *Adam and Sargon in the Land of the Hittites*, PSBA 37²²⁷. (109) New information on Sargon was given by Scheil in his *Nouveaux renseignements sur Šarrukin d'après un texte Sumérien*, RA 13¹⁷⁵⁻¹⁷⁹. It appears that Sargon was a Semite, son of a shepherd called Laipum and that his war with the Sumerians was caused by his taking one of the wives of Lugalzaggisi. (110) *The opening lines of the legend of Sargon* were retranslated by D. D. Luckenbill, AJSL 33¹⁴⁵⁻¹⁴⁶. (111) B. Meissner gave *eine unerkannte Inschrift Naram-Sins*, OLZ 1915¹⁷³⁻¹⁷⁴. (112) Ungnad showed that Naram-Sin reigned later than Maništušu (Maništušu und Naram-Sin, OLZ 1915³²⁴⁻³²⁵). (113) The older spelling Hammurabi was defended by D. D. Luckenbill (*The name Hammurabi*, JAOS 37²⁵⁰⁻²⁵³) against Ungnad's reading Hammurapi. The etymology remains doubtful. (114) Meek wrote on king Sin-Iribam of the first Babylonian dynasty, AJSL 31²⁸⁶. (115) Poebel wrote on *eine sumerische Inschrift Samsuilunas*, OLZ 1915^{106-111 129-136}, this text being one of those already published by him (PBS V No. 101). (116) *The Assyrian Chronicle* was studied by A. T. Olmstead, JAOS 35³⁴⁴⁻³⁶⁸, and

also (117) *Tiglath-Pileser I and his wars*, JAOS 37¹⁶⁹⁻¹⁸⁵. (118) Bezold wrote a valuable review of *Klauber's Politisch Religiöse Texte aus der Sargonidenzeit*, ZA 30¹²³⁻¹²⁷. (119) W. F. Albright a long note on *Thureau-Dangin's Huitième Campagne de Sargon* in JAOS 36²²⁵⁻²³². (120) Two new prisms of Esarhaddon edited by Scheil in the *Délégation en Perse* were discussed by C. H. W. Johns, *Fresh light on the history of Esarhaddon*, PSBA 37⁴⁷⁻⁴⁹. (121) A valuable review of Scheil, *Le prisme d'Esarhaddon* was given by Hoschander, JQR⁶⁵²⁻⁶⁵⁴. (122) After having been kept many years in the press, VAB VII, was published in 1916. It is composed of three volumes by M. Streck on *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Nineveh's*. The first volume is an introduction with a chronological and historical study. The second volume gives transliterations, the third is a glossary. Documents of Assur-etil-ilani and Sin-šar-iškun are included. (123) B. Meissner wrote on *Die Gemahlin Assurbanipals*, OLZ 1915³⁷⁻³⁸ whose name is to be read Assur-šarrat; (124) P. Haupt, on *The Disease of King Teumman*, JSOR I⁸⁸⁻⁹¹, which was a form of epilepsy; (125) G. Hüsing on *Gugu*, OLZ 1915²²⁹⁻³⁰³ (king Gyges). (126) *The last years of the Assyrian monarchy* were studied by C. H. W. Johns, PSBA 38¹¹⁹, in a short chronological discussion. (127) *The New inscriptions of Nabunaid* in CT 34, were studied by Langdon, AJSL 32¹⁰²⁻¹¹⁷. (128) Pinches studied *Two late tablets of historical interest*, PSBA 38²⁷⁻³⁴, one of which mentions Belshazzar and Gobryas. (Cf. also 362).

The growth of the Babylonian Law becomes now clearer to us. (129) W. Soltau reviewed Kohler und Wenger's *Orientalisches Recht* in *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, 1915, No. 44. (130) *The social legislation of the Primitive Semites* was studied by H. Schaeffer. (131) Cf. review by Pinches, JRAS 1917¹⁸⁵⁻¹⁸⁸. (132) Mercer's articles on *Sumerian morals*, JSOR I⁴⁷⁻⁸⁴, is closely connected with the subject. (133) An excellent résumé of *Babylonian Law* was written by C. H. W. Johns, ERE, VII (1915)⁸¹⁷⁻⁸²³. (134) Langdon gave us in text 21 of his *Sumerian Grammatical Texts* (Cf. No. 22) a fragment of a Sumerian code of Laws. (135) P. Haupt studied *Das fünfte sumerische Familiengesetz*, ZA 30⁹³⁻⁹⁵. (136) D. D. Luckenbill wrote on the fragment of Hammurabi's code published by Langdon in BE XXXI (AJSL 31²²³). (137) Poebel had given another frag-

ment from Nippur (PBS, V No. 93) and wrote extensively thereon in OLZ 1915¹⁶¹⁻¹⁶⁹, 193-200, 225-230 (*Eine altbabylonische Abschrift der Gesetzes Sammlung Hammurabis aus Nippur*) (138) A short note was contributed to the subject by G. A. Barton, AJSL 31²²⁵, and very thorough studies by (139) Scheil, RA 13⁴⁹⁻⁵⁴, and E. Cug, RA 13¹⁴³⁻¹⁵⁸ (*Les nouveaux fragments du Code de Hammourabi*). (140) An excellent study of the Codex was written by M. Jastrow (*Older and later elements in the Code of Hammurabi*, JAOS 36¹⁻³³) who showed that roughly one-third of the code is older. (141) What we know of *Marriage* (Semitic) was summarized by Barton, ERE VII⁴⁶⁸⁻⁴⁶⁹. (142) A thorough study of the two only cases of bigamy recorded in Babylonian business documents was made by P. Cruveilhier, *La monogamie et le concubinat dans le Code de Hammourabi*, Revue Biblique, 1917²⁷⁰⁻²⁸⁶. (Cf. also No. 53.) (143) The procedure of *inspectio ventris* was studied by M. Schorr (*Ein Anwendungsfall der inspectio ventris im altbabylonischen Rechte*, WZKM 29 (1915)⁷⁴⁻⁹⁶) in a study of Poebel, PBS, V No. 101. (144) D. D. Luckenbill maintained that the levirate marriage was practised in Babylonia (AJSL 33¹⁴⁶) and (145) wrote on *the Temple women of the Code of Hammurabi*, AJSL 34¹⁻¹². (146) On the same subject B. Landsberger treated *Zu den Frauenklassen des Kodex Hammurabi*, ZA 30⁶⁷⁻⁷³. The question of patria potestas and its judiciary consequences was studied (147) by E. Cuq, *Le droit de gage en Chaldée*, RA 12⁸⁵⁻¹¹³, (148) *the son's portion* by A. T. Clay, ET 27⁴⁰⁻⁴², with a comparison with the case of the prodigal son. (149) An exhaustive study of the *Ordeal* was written by Langdon for ERE IX⁵¹³⁻⁵¹⁴; (150) a rather incomplete study on the *Oath* (Semitic) by M. A. Canney, ERE IX⁴³⁶⁻⁴³⁸. (151) A paragraph of the code (XV, l. 65 ff.) dealing with the blowing of a horn to signify to the shepherds that the grazing season was over was dealt with and illustrated by a map by Langdon, MJ 7²⁶⁸. The legal term (152) *put biti ullulu* was explained by Scheil, RA 12¹¹⁵⁻¹¹⁶, and also (153) the legal formula *qatam nasahu*, to draw the hand, RA 14⁹⁴⁻⁹⁶. Cf. also No. 53.

BUSINESS DOCUMENTS by thousands have found their way into public and private collections. (154) G. A. Barton published *Sumerian business and administrative documents from the earliest times to the dynasty of Agade* (PBS IX, No. 1, 1915). Text No. 2 is the only inscription of En-hegal. Barton gives an interpretation of the two

archaic stone tablets and of four other documents published there. As it was pointed in (155) Vanderburgh's valuable review, *AJSL* 33¹⁵⁰⁻¹⁵⁶, two of the texts were Semitic (Nos. 20 and 21). On text No. 25, cf. Ungnad, *OLZ* 1915³²⁵. (Cf. No. 112.) (156) A shorter review was given by B. Meissner, *TL* 1916¹²²⁻¹²³. (157) Nikolsky 161 was translated by W. Förtsch, *OLZ* 1915⁵. (158) Langdon reviewed Legrain's *Temps des rois d'Ur*, *RA* 13⁴³⁻⁴⁷. (159) Miss M. I. Hussey published *Sumerian tablets in the Harvard Semitic Museum from the time of the Dynasty of Ur* (Harvard Semitic Series, Vol. IV, 1915); (160) E. Margolis some *Sumerian Temple Documents* (1915) of little interest or value; (161) Meek, *Old Babylonian business and legal documents* (the RFH collection), *AJSL* 33²⁰³⁻²⁴⁴. (162) Pinches, *Some texts of the Relph Collection*, *PSBA* 39^{4-15, 55-72}. The same scholar gave us. (163) *The Babylonian tablets of the Berens Collection*, 1915, a (Royal) Asiatic Society monograph. (164) Cf. review by Sayce, *JRAS*, 1915⁸²²⁻⁸²⁵. (165) A hundred tablets were edited with an introduction by G. Contenau in his *Contribution à l'étude économique d'Umma*. (166) Cf. review by Pinches, *JRAS* 1917⁸⁴⁸⁻⁸⁵⁰. Dr. Contenau gave us other texts in his (167) *Tablettes de comptabilité relatives à l'industrie du cuivre à Umma*, *RA* 12¹⁵⁻²⁵, and in his (168) *Tablettes de comptabilité relatives à l'industrie du vêtement à Umma*, *RA* 12¹⁴⁷⁻¹⁵⁷. (169) Fifty-eight tablets from Umma were published by C. L. Bedale (*Sumerian tablets from Umma*, 1915) who copied them in the John Ryland Library. (170) Cf. a review by L. Delaporte, *JA* Sept.-Oct., 1915³³⁸. (171) Nikolsky published 530 tablets (447 from Umma, the others from Drehem (Moscow, 1915 n.s.)). (172) M. Schorr reviewed Figulla's *Altbabylonische Vorträge* in *GGA* 1915⁴¹⁴⁻⁴²⁷. We have already noted texts published by Scheil (cf. No. 82) and two well-known contracts studied anew by Cruveilhier (cf. No. 142). Some texts published by Pinches will be noticed later (cf. No. 288). (173) Miss M. L. Hussey studied a *Conveyance of land dated in the reign of Ellil-bani*, *JAOS* 36³⁴⁻³⁶. (174) E. Grant, *A new type of documents from Senkereh*, *AJSL* 33²⁰⁰⁻²⁰² (a study on VAT 7739 = No. 84 in VS 13, where three relatives of the slave undertake to be sureties for her behavior); (175) V. Scheil studied five texts dealing with business in some *Notules*, *RA* XIII¹²⁵⁻⁵²⁷, (176) and another text in a *notule*, *RA* 14⁹²⁻⁹³. We have already noticed (cf. No. 143) a legal document dealing with *inspectio*

ventris. (177) Three business documents of the *Semitic inscriptions of the Harding Smith collection* were edited by Pinches, JRAS Oct. 1917⁷²³⁻⁷³⁴. Also a contract (178) with an early mention of the *Nahr Malka*, JRAS Oct. 1917⁷³⁵⁻⁷⁴⁰. (179) *Zwei Kaufkontrakte*, from the time of Ammi-Ditana, were studied by O. Schroeder, ZA 30⁸⁴⁻⁸⁷. A legal document described by Scheil as (180) *La liberation judiciaire d'un fils donné en gage sous Neriglissar* (558 B. C.) was edited by him in RA 12¹⁻¹³. Three contracts one of them dealing with the hiring of a hundred *Sumerian women for field work* (181) were given by Pinches, JRAS 1915⁴⁵⁷⁻⁴⁶³. Cf. No. 128 for two Neo-Babylonian texts published also by Pinches. A text dealing with errands was given by (182) Scheil in a *notule*, RA 12¹⁹⁴⁻¹⁹⁵. An excellent review of Clay's *Babylonian Business Documents* (1912-1913) was contributed by (183) Hoschander to the JQR 5⁶⁴⁷⁻⁶⁵².

LETTERS (184) *A letter from Rim-Sin* was edited by D. D. Luckenbill, AJSL 32⁹⁸⁻¹⁰¹. The same scholar gave us (185) *Old Babylonian Letters from Bismya*, AJSL 32²⁷⁰⁻²⁹². (186) Torczyner wrote on *eine talmudische Redewendung in altbabylonischen Briefen*, OLZ 1915²⁰³. (187) Ungnad published *Babylonian Letters of the Hammurabi period* (1915), PBS VII; a few of these were transliterated and translated in that volume. Text No. 133 is a new code of Hammurabi referring to the rebuilding of the walls of Sippar. Reviews of that volume were contributed by (188) A. T. Clay, AJTH 20⁴²⁷⁻⁴³⁰, and (189) D. D. Luckenbill, AJSL 32³⁰⁹⁻³¹⁰. A letter from Hammurabi's time was edited by (190) Ungnad (*Ein altbabylonischer Brief aus kriegerischen Zeiten*), OLZ 1914.

(191) O. Schroeder gave us the Berlin collection of Amarna letters in *Die Tontafeln von El-Amarna* (1915). (192) *The Murch fragment of an El-Amarna Letter* was reëdited by Luckenbill with a note on the hieratic docket by T. G. Allen, AJSL 33¹⁻⁸. Weber and Ebeling completed the Glossary of (193) Knudtzon's *Die El Amarna Tafeln* (VAB II, 1915). Schroeder wrote some valuable notes on the texts published by him. (194) *Zur Amarnatafel VAT 1704*, OLZ 1915¹⁷⁴⁻¹⁷⁶. (195) *ilu A = ilu A-ma-na*, OLZ 1915³²⁶⁻³²⁷; (196) *Ueber den Namen des Tamuz von Byblos in der Amarna-Zeit* (in VAT 1633, under the form Damu) OLZ 1915²⁹¹⁻²⁹³; (197) on the city *Zuhru*, *ibid.*²⁹³⁻²⁹⁴; (198) on *alu bit ilu Nin-ib = Bethelhem* (Bit-Lahama), *ibid.*²⁹⁴ (in Abd-hiba's letter). From his first hand knowledge A. H.

Sayce wrote on (199) *The Discovery of the Tel El-Amarna tablets*, AJSL 33⁸⁹⁻⁹⁰.

A Semitic letter from the Kassite period (Text No. 24) was published by Langdon in his Sumerian Grammatical texts already noticed (cf. No. 22). F. A. Vanderburgh edited (200) *A business letter of Anu-šar-uššur*, JAOS 36³³⁸⁻³³⁶.

(201) A valuable review of vol. 10 and 11 of Harper's Letters was contributed by S. Schiffer, OLZ 1915¹³⁻¹⁶; a review of Harper XII-XIII (202) by Pinches, JRAS 1915¹⁵⁹⁻¹⁶¹.

A new element in the problem of the origins of CIVILIZATION was brought in by (203) Benedite apropos of a knife-handle published by him in *Monuments et Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, vol. 32. W. M. Flinders Petrie commented on this Discovery in (204) *Egypt and Mesopotamia*, AE 1917²⁶⁻³⁶. Petrie's conclusions are that the Elamite civilization developed in the Solutrean age, a whole cycle before the Egyptian development in the Magdalenian Age. There was in Elam a mountain people, shaven or close-cropped like the Sumerians, akin to the black men in the Hierakonpolis tomb. They eventually moved to Egypt and became the ancestors of the makers of the slate-palettes, of Narmer and his people.

(205) Jastrow gave us a popular yet scholarly and exhaustive book on *the Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria* (1915). A valuable review was contributed by (206) Hoschander. JQR 1917, 7⁴³⁹⁻⁴⁴⁴. The reviewer took issue with E. Meyer's theory (followed by Jastrow) that the Semitic civilization antedated the Sumerian. The Bible (Gen. 11¹⁻²) tells us that the early Babylonians came from the East, consequently were not Semites. Another important review was written by (207) Luckenbill, AJSL 33²⁵²⁻²⁵⁴.

On the question of Pan-Babylonianism we must note (208) Hoschander's review of Jeremias' *Handbuch der altorientalischen Geisteskultur*, JQR 5⁶³⁴⁻⁶³⁷. Cf. also No. 80.

The influence of Sumerian culture in Babylonia was studied by (209) Zimmern in his *Akkadisches Fremdwörter*. Cf. reviews by (210) Luckenbill, AJSL 32³⁰⁹ and (211) König, TLB 1915, 17.

On metallurgy we had (212) a *notule* by Scheil, *A propos des métaux à Umma*, RA 12⁶⁰⁻⁶², in addition to Contenau's article already mentioned (cf. No. 167).

Textile work was studied by Contenau (cf. No. 168) and (213) F. von Oefele who wrote on linen-weaving at the time of the Ur dynasty, JAOS 36⁴¹⁵. (214) A. de la Fuye wrote on *l'origine du grec chiton*, a communication to the Parisian Société Asiatique. He derived *chiton* from *kitu*, linen. Cf. JA 1915 May-June⁵⁴².

On the art of writing in addition to the important note of O. Schroeder already mentioned (Cf. No. 38) which shows that the Babylonians used parchment, we must call attention to (215) J. H. Breasted's article on *The physical process of writing in the early Orient and their relation to the origin of the alphabet*, AJSL 32²³⁻²⁴⁹. Breasted took a parchment roll on reliefs reproduced on p. 243-244 for a roll of papyrus.

NAMES. An exhaustive article on (216) (Sumerian) *Names* was written by Langdon, ERE 1917 IX¹⁷¹⁻¹⁷⁵. (217) Chiera published a *List of personal names from the Temple School of Nippur; a syllabary of proper names*, PBS XI, 1. (1916) with a number of school texts.

(218) *Names* (Babylonian) received an exhaustive treatment by Clay, ERE, IX¹⁴¹⁻¹⁴³. (219) Chiera in another volume of his *List of personal names*, etc., PBS XI, 2, gave us a list of Akkadian and Amoritic personal names. Important reviews of Tallquist's Assyrian personal names were contributed by (220) Ungnad, OLZ 1915²⁴⁰⁻²⁴⁷ and (221) Pinches, JRAS 1916⁸⁵⁸⁻⁸⁶⁰. A valuable review of Holma's *Assyrisch-babylonischen Personennamen der Form quttulu* (1914) was contributed by (222) B. Landsberger, GGA 1915³⁶³⁻³⁶⁶.

Assyro-babylonian views about NATURE were studied by (223). A. S. Carrier, ERE IX²⁴⁹⁻²⁵⁰. (224) A better article on *Die Assyrier und die Natur* was written by Meissner, AF I¹⁻¹⁸. The texts and reliefs on the lion were studied by (225) P. H. Boussac (*Iconographie zoologique des monuments assyrochaldéens*) RA 12¹⁷³⁻¹⁸³.

The subject of *Literature* (Babylonian) was treated by Bezold, ERE 1916, VIII⁸³⁻⁸⁵. Considerable work has been done on the MYTHS AND RELIGIOUS TEXTS (226) Ebeling published *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur religiösen Inhalts*, I and II, 1915. Cf. reviews by (227) B. Meissner, OLZ 1915³³¹⁻³³⁷, and (228) Langdon, RA 13⁹⁹⁻¹⁰³. (229) Langdon published some most important *Sumerian Liturgical texts*, PBS X 2 (1917). (230) Cf. review by Mercer, JSOR I⁹³⁻⁹⁵.

Langdon discovered part of the oldest form of the epic of Gilgamesh, written in Sumerian. He published an important part of the

Semitic text in (231) *The epic of Gilgamesh*, PBS X 3 (1917). Cf. also (232) Langdon's popular article, *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, MJ 8²⁹⁻³⁸. (233) P. Jensen wrote *Zu Vorgeschichte des Gilgameš-Epos*, Sachau's Festschrift⁷²⁻⁸⁶. (234) J. Morgenstern wrote *On Gilgameš Epic* 11²⁷⁴⁻³²⁰ in LA 29²⁸⁴⁻³⁰⁰, a study of the rôle of the serpent in Semitic mythology. According to him, the original story was that Gilgamesh by eating the plant of life would cast off his old skin and thereby renew his youth. The serpent ate the plant instead of Gilgamesh and thus serpents cast their skins and renew their youth while men are mortals. (235) W. Förtsch wrote on *Der Vater des Gilgameš*, OLZ 1915³⁶⁷⁻³⁷⁰. His name was A and he was high priest of Kullab.

(236) Langdon gave a translation of part of *the Sumerian original of the descent of Ishtar*, PSBA 38⁵⁵⁻⁵⁷. Cf. his popular article (237) *Ishtar's descent to hell*, MS 7¹⁷⁸⁻¹⁸¹. (238) The Assur text (Semitic) was studied by J. A. Maynard, AJSL 34²⁴⁻²⁹.

(239) Langdon published *A bilingual tablet from Erech*, RA 12⁷³⁻⁸⁴, being part of an epic on the mother-goddess. (240) Zimmern studied KL 213, 214 in his *Ishtar und Šaltu* (1916), the latter being a personified Discordia.

The epic Lugal-e was studied by (241) S. Geller (*Die Sumerische-Assyrische serie Lugal-e me-lam-bi nig-gal*) (n. s.) who also gave a new text Bab J 5326. Maynard in his *Studies in religious texts from Assur*, AJSL 34²¹⁻⁵⁹, studied both this epic and the new Assur texts of Ana-dim-dim-ma. (Cf. No. 238.)

One of the most important texts was Langdon's (242) *Sumerian Epic of Paradise, the Flood and the Fall of Man*, PBS X 1. (1915). (243) The best review was contributed by Scheil, CR 1915⁵²⁶⁻⁵³⁷ who compared the story to the idyllic reliefs on a Susian kudurru. Cf. Délégation en Perse, 8, pl. 27-28, p. 149. Scheil study of Rev. 3 of Langdon's text is especially valuable. An important but severe review was written by (244) Fossey, RC 1917²⁷³⁻²⁷⁶. A valuable contribution was made by (245) A. H. Sayce, ET 27⁸⁸⁻⁹⁰, and by Langdon, (246) ET 27¹⁶⁵⁻¹⁶⁸. A. Lods wrote from the point of view of a thorough Old Testament scholar (247) *Un poème babylonien sur l'âge d'or, le déluge et la chute*, RTP 1916²⁶⁹⁻²⁸⁶. This new text roused some controversy in America. (248) J. D. Prince wrote on *the so-called Epic of Paradise*, JAOS 36⁹⁰⁻¹¹⁴; (249) Jastrow on *the Sumerian view of beginnings*, JAOS 36¹²²⁻¹³⁵ = Revue archeologique, 4³⁵⁸⁻³⁷²;

(250) Langdon answered by *Critical notes upon the Epic of Paradise* JAOS 36¹⁴⁰⁻¹⁴⁵. (251) Then Prince wrote *Further notes on the so-called Epic of Paradise*, JAOS 36²⁶⁹⁻²⁷³, and (252) Jastrow, *Sumerian and Akkadian views of beginnings*, JAOS 36²⁷⁴⁻²⁹⁹. Jastrow wrote also (253) *Sumerian myths of beginnings*, AJSL 33⁹¹⁻¹⁴⁴, taking the story as a series of disconnected episodes. (254) Langdon wrote *The necessary revisions of the Sumerian Epic of Paradise*, AJSL 33²⁴⁰⁻²⁴⁹, and maintained in the main his position. (255) Barton gave a new translation of the text in his *Archaeology and the Bible*²⁸³⁻²⁸⁹ and took up the question again in his (256) *New Babylonian material concerning Creation and the Paradise*, AJTh 21⁵⁷¹. (257) Jastrow's theory of a *hieros gamos* was endorsed by A. L. Frothingham in a remarkable article on the *Babylonian origin of Hermes the snake-god and of the caduceus*, ASA 20¹⁷⁵⁻²¹¹, and by (258) A. J. Carnoy, *Iranian Views of Origins in connection with Similar Babylonian Beliefs*, JAOS 36³⁰⁰⁻³²⁰. Langdon is preparing a new edition of the text and it seems that after a time his position will be accepted by all.

(259) *The myths and legends of Babylonia and Assyria* received a popular — but often inaccurate treatment at the hands of L. Spence (1917). (260) The Book was reviewed with deserved severity by Meek, AJTh 1917⁴⁵⁹⁻⁴⁶⁰. (261) Langdon studied *A tablet of Babylonian wisdom*, PSBA 38^{105-116 131-137}. (262) Maynard, *Some Babylonian Patriotic Sayings*, JSOR I⁸⁵⁻⁸⁷. In his *Sumerian Grammatical texts*, already mentioned (No. 22), Langdon gave a number of religious texts.

Langdon is preparing a new edition of his *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*. He has given us (263) *A hymn to Enlil with a theological redaction*, RA 12²⁷⁻³², being a new translation of SBP 276. (264) He studied *A hymn to Tammuz*, RA 12³³⁻⁴⁵ (already edited by Scheil, RA 8¹⁶¹⁻¹⁶⁹). (265) He reëdited BL No. 146 as *A fragment of a liturgy to Ninib*, PSBA 37⁶⁶⁻⁷⁰. (266) Prince studied VAT 6705 in *A hymn to Ninkasi*, ASSL 33⁴⁰⁻⁴⁴. Maynard studied two Gula-texts, AJSL 34⁵³⁻³⁹. (Cf. No. 238.) (267) A valuable review of Langdon's *Historical and Religious Texts* was written by Luckenbill, ASSL 31²²²⁻²²³. (268) Fossey reviewed Meek's BA, XI (Cuneiform bilingual hymns), RC 1917²⁷⁶⁻²⁷⁷, showing that Meek 1¹¹⁻¹² = Shurpu 5^{47, 48}. (269) Schollmeyer wrote on K. 8447 = Meek No. 7 in ZA 30⁸¹⁻⁸³ and (270) on Langdon's *Babylonian Liturgies*, ZA 30⁸¹⁻⁸³. (271) Scholl-

meyer's bilingual hymns to Shamash were reviewed by Figulla, OLZ 1915³⁷¹⁻³⁷⁵. (272) Prince studied some *šu-illa* texts in *A new Šamaš-šum-ukin series*, ASSL 31²⁶⁶. (273) Bezold gave a valuable review of Klauber's book already noticed (cf. No. 118). Langdon wrote (274) a popular article on *A ritual of atonement for a Babylonian king* (shamash-shum-ukin), MJ 8³⁹⁻⁴⁴. (275) Jensen published *Texte zur assyrisch-babylonischen Religion*, KB VI, 2. (276) Cf. review by M. Schorr, LZB 1915 No. 42, sp. 1039. (277) One of Ebeling's new texts (No. 34) was studied by O. Schroeder, *Eine Wasserbeschwörung aus Assur*, ZA 30⁸⁸⁻⁹¹. (278) A short article on Babylonian *Hymns* was written by Pinches, ERE 7¹⁹¹⁵.

RELIGION (279) Meissner reviewed Paffrath's zur Gotterlehre in den altbabylonischen Koenigsinschriften in DLZ 1915 No. 22 Sp. 532. Langdon's epoch-making book on Tammuz and Ishtar was reviewed by (280) B. Meissner, LZB 1915, No. 15, and (281) Luckenbill, AJSL 32⁷⁶⁻⁸⁰. Langdon studied (282) *A ritual of atonement addressed to Tammuz and Ishtar*, RA 13¹⁰⁵⁻¹¹⁸. In an article (283) on *the worship of Tammuz*, J. P. Peters maintained that the "Word" in Sumerian hymns is to be interpreted literally as a storm. (JBL 36¹⁰⁰⁻¹¹¹.) We have already noticed (cf. No. 196) Schroeder article on Tammuz in the Amarna Letters. (284) Barton's *Tammuz and Osiris*, JAOS 35²¹³⁻²²³, showed that both cults are survivals of a primitive cult common to both Hamites and Semites. (285) Langdon's article on *Mysteries*, ERE IX⁷⁰⁻⁷², is exhaustive.

(286) W. Foertsch wrote *zur e-šag-gi-pad-da Weihinschrift des Gimil-sin von Ur*, OLZ 1915²⁰¹⁻²⁰³. (287) In a *notule*, Scheil gave us a votive inscription of Zitti-Bau for the life of ^dBur-Sin, RA 13¹⁸⁰. (288) Pinches gave us 8 business documents and *Notes on the deification of kings and ancestor-worship in Babylonia*, PSBA 37^{87-95; 126-134}. On the subject of king-worship much will be found in Langdon's Sumerian Liturgical Texts already noticed (cf. 229). (289) Mercer wrote on *Emperor-worship in Babylonia*, JAOS 36³⁶⁰⁻³⁸⁰, an article which called forth from (290) G. A. Barton, *A word with reference to Emperor-worship in Babylonia*, JAOS 37¹⁶²⁻¹⁶³. (291) The subject was also treated by A. S. Tritton in an article on *King (Semitic)*, ERE VII⁷²⁶⁻⁷²⁷, and by (292) Barton, *Incarnation (Semitic)*, ERE VII²⁰⁰. (293) Hehn's book on *Die biblische und die babylonische Gottesidee* was reviewed by Hoschander, JQR 5⁶²⁰⁻⁶²⁷.

Deimel's Pantheon Babylonicum was reviewed by (294) W. Foertsch, OLZ 1915⁸⁰⁻⁸⁴; (295) Meek, AJSL 31²⁸⁸⁻²⁸⁹; (296) Teloni, RSO 7²⁶⁴⁻²⁶⁶. Clay's book (Cf. No. 7) gave us the new readings Shara, Sullat, Urta. (297) W. Foertsch wanted us to read ^dEn-PA (= ^dNusku) as ^dEn-dûr (cf. No. 20). Chiera raised incidentally (cf. No. 216) the question whether in Nippurian texts ^dIM should not be read Ellil.

(298) Steinmetzer wrote on *Die Sinnbilder auf dem Grenzstein des Nazi-Marutaš*, Sachau's Festschrift⁶²⁻⁷¹; (299) W. J. Hinke on *The significance of the symbols on Babylonian Boundary-Stones*, ASA 20⁷⁶⁻⁷⁷; (300) L. W. King on *Images and Idols*, ERE 7¹¹⁷⁻¹¹⁹.

(301) Schroeder reminded us that some divine names were epicoenic and that there was a goddess Za-gá-gá, OLZ 19⁷⁵⁻⁷⁶. (302) W. Foertsch wrote on *Sumerische Wirtschaftstexte*, RSO 7¹⁶⁵⁻¹⁹⁸, giving us translations of tablets relating to offerings to the gods. (303) W. Reimpell wrote on *Sumerische Altaere*, ZA 30⁷⁹⁻⁸⁰; (304) A. L. Frothingham on *Orientation from Babylon to Rome*, AJA 1915⁷³; (305) I. M. Price on *Some Observations on the financial Importance of the Temple in the First Dynasty of Babylon*, AJSL 32²⁵⁰⁻²⁶⁰; (306) Scheil on *La promesse dans la prière babylonienne*, RA 12⁶⁵⁻⁷², giving us texts where money was promised and paid to a god in case the prayer was heard. (307) Scheil gave us some *Textes funeraires* from Susa, RA 13¹⁶⁵⁻¹⁷⁴, showing the importance of proper burial, and the shades justified after the judgment enjoyed rest and pleasant food and water. (308) An excellent article on *Ishtar* was written by L. B. Paton, ERE 7⁴²⁸⁻⁴³⁴. (309) W. Cruikshank wrote on *Light and Darkness (Semitic)*, ERE 8⁶²⁻⁶⁶, and (310) L. W. King on *Magic*, ERE 8²⁵³⁻²⁵⁵. (311) Waterman wrote on the kerubs AJSL 31²⁵²; (312) Barton on *Ancient Babylonian expressions of the Religious Spirit*, JAOS 37²³⁻⁴².

(313) An outline of Babylonian religion was given by the same scholar in his *Religions of the World* (1917)¹⁶⁻³³. Another outline, but of a poor quality, was written by (314) J. R. Mozley, *The Divine Aspect of history* (1916), Vol. I, Chapter 2.

DIVINATION. (315) M. Witzel wrote on *Zur Inkubation bei Gudea*, ZA 30¹⁰¹⁻¹⁰⁵; (316) Langdon on *A Babylonian tablet on the interpretation of dreams*, MJ 8¹¹⁶⁻¹²²; (317) Daiches wrote on some of Boissier's texts, *Babylonian dog-omens and some Talmudic and Later Jewish*

Parallels, PSBA 39¹⁶⁸⁻¹⁷¹; (318) Virolleaud gave additional corrections to CT 28, 30, 31 in JA 1917 I¹⁶⁷⁻¹⁶⁹ completing (319) Boissier's *Seconde note sur la publication des textes divinatoires du British Museum* (n. s.). (320) Langdon gave some *Philological comments on* K 45, PSBA 37⁴²⁻⁴³, and (321) H. Holma, *Further notes on the tablet K* 45, PSBA 37¹¹³⁻¹¹⁶. (322) Langdon edited the Omen-text, R 122, RA 13²⁷⁻³³, and (323) *A fragment of a series of ritualistic prayers to astral deities in the ceremonies of divination*, RA 13¹⁸⁹⁻¹⁹².

ASTRONOMY. Weidner's *Alter und Bedeutung der Babylonischer Astronomie* was reviewed by (324) E. Mahler, DLZ 1915 No. 48, and (325) B. Teloni, RSO 7²⁶⁷. (326) Weidner gave us a *Handbuch der babylonischen Astronomie*, 1915, from the pan-babylonian standpoint. (Cf. also 208.) (327) Neugebauer and Weidner wrote on *ein astronomischer Beobachtungstext aus dem 37 Jahre Nebukadenzars II*, 1915, a monograph dealing also with economics and raising important lexicographical points. (328) Offord wrote on the crescent form taken by Venus and its influence on Ishtar's characters in *The Deity of the Crescent*, JRAS 1915¹⁹⁷.

CALENDAR. (329) B. Landsberger studied the divers Sumerian month-lists and the Semitic list and the religious festivals (*Der kultische Kalendar der Babylonier und Assyrier*, LSS VI 1, 2) (1915). (330) W. Foertsch wrote a new presargonic month called ki-su-šurug-ga-a, OLZ 19³⁹⁻⁴⁰; (331) Weidner showed the Babylonian culture underlying Enoch 72^{6ff}, (partition of day and night according to different months), OLZ 19⁷⁴⁻⁷⁵.

FIELD-SURVEYS. (332) In his study of *an ancient Babylonian map* (of fields) Langdon gives a popular account of the survey-system — (MJ 7²⁶³⁻²⁶⁸). Allotte de la Fuye published (333) *Un cadastre de Djokha*, RA 12⁴⁷⁻⁵⁴, and (334) *Mesures agraires et formules d'arpentage à l'époque présargonique*, RA 12¹¹⁷⁻¹⁴⁶.

MATHEMATICS. (335) G. Kewitsch touched on Babylonian numeration in *Zur Entstehung des 60-systems*, ZA 29²⁶⁵⁻²⁸². The mathematical text Ni. 10201 (Cf. BE XX, 1, No. 25) where Hilprecht had seen Plato's famous number was explained by (336) Scheil RA 13¹³⁸⁻¹⁴² as a mere schoolboy's exercise. (337) Scheil gave us a mathematical text in a *notule*, RA 12¹⁹⁵⁻¹⁹⁸, and (338) wrote on *le calcul des volumes dans un cas particulier à l'époque d'Ur*, RA 12¹⁶¹⁻¹⁷¹. (339) C. M. Watson took up the subject of *Babylonian measures of length*, PSBA 37⁶⁰⁻⁶⁵.

ART. (340) G. S. Duncan wrote a popular and well illustrated article on *the art of the Sumerians*, *Art and Archaeology*, 1917⁹³⁻¹⁰⁰. (341) Continuing his *Grundzuege der altbabylonischen Plastik*, Meissner wrote *Grundzuege der mittel- und neubabylonischen und der assyrischen Plastik*, *Der Alte Orient*, XV, 3, 4, 1915. (342) A. Paterson wrote on *Assyrian sculpture*, 1915 (n. s.). A new relief representing Assurbanapal's queen was described by (343) Meissner, *OLZ* 18³⁷⁻³⁸. Monuments of Entemena and Lugalkisalsi were already noticed (cf. Nos. 101 and 102). W. Max Müller touched on the technique in (344) *Steinbohrer in Altbabylonien*, *OLZ* 1915²⁶⁶. (345) C. Dombart published a monograph on Zikkurat und Pyramide, 1915 (n. s.). Cf. *OLZ* 1915²⁵⁶. (346) T. Schmit included Babylonia in his Introduction to the history of Art (in Russian, n. s.) 1916. (347) G. Contenau showed that Assyrian sculpture was not altogether conventional *JA* 1917 I¹⁸¹⁻¹⁸⁹.

CYLINDERS (348) The same scholars studied the question of the extension of the influence of Sumerian Art in *Les cylindres syro-hittites*, *RA* 14⁶¹⁻⁷⁴. (349) He published some *Cylindres anépigraphes de la collection Lycklama* (Cannes), *RA* 13⁶³⁻⁶⁸. (350) Scheil published other cylinders in a *notule*, *RA* 12⁵⁵⁻⁶⁰ and in his (351) *Cylindres et legendes inédits*, *RA* 13⁵⁻²⁶. He called attention to a seal probably of the time of Manishtushu with the name of Iš-re-il (Israel).

MUSIC (352) (*Babylonian and Assyrian*) was described by Pinches, *ERE* 9¹³⁻¹⁴.

MEDICINE. Medical texts were published by Scheil in (353) a *notule*, *RA* 14⁸⁷⁻⁸⁹, and (354) *Un document médical assyrien*, *RA* 13³⁵⁻⁴². (355) We had a note from F. von Oefele on *Babylonian titles of medical text books*, *JAOS* 37²⁵⁰⁻²⁵⁶.

BABEL AND BIBLE. (356) Jastrow's book on Hebrew and Babylonian Literature was reviewed by Hoschander, *JQR* 5⁶¹⁵⁻⁶²⁰. We have already mentioned Barton's *Archaeology and the Bible* (cf. No. 255) and the controversy on Langdon's *Epic of Paradise* (cf. Nos. 242 to 256). Clay's book (cf. No. 7) contained texts with a possible bearing on the sabbath (texts 46-51). (357) Cf. Maynard in J. R. Webster, *The sign of the covenant*¹¹⁶⁻¹²⁰. We noticed Scheil's discovery of the name Israel in cuneiform (cf. No. 351). (358) Hoschander wrote on *Yahweh in cuneiform*, *JQR* 5⁶³⁴; (359) Sayce on *the Land of Nod* as Ni-du = Dilmun, the end of the world,

PSBA 38⁶⁻¹⁰; (360) Hoschander gave us a note on the Habiri. (Cf. also an article by Pinches noticed under No. 106. Schroeder's article on Bethlehem as a sanctuary of Ninib was also noticed (cf. No. 198) as well as Hoschander's review of Hehn's book (cf. No. 293) and Clay's article (cf. No. 148) on the son's portion which may bear on the history of the prodigal son. (361) L. Waterman reviewed Johns' book on the Relation of the Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew peoples, *AJSL* 23²⁵⁴⁻²⁵⁷. Clay tried to show the historicity of Belshazzar in his book (cf. No. 7) and (362) in an article on *the rehabilitation of Belshazzar*, *Art and Archeology*, 1916¹⁹⁰. Conservative but not particularly scientific books were written by (363) R. D. Wilson, *Studies in the book of Daniel* and (364) T. J. Thorburn, *The mythical interpretation of the Gospels*. They both touched the question of the relation of Babylonia and the Bible, but do not show a first-hand knowledge of the subject.

REVIEWS

An Introduction to the Old Testament Chronologically Arranged.
By Harlan Creelman, Ph.D., D.D., *With a Foreword by Frank Knight Sanders, Ph.D., D.D.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1917. P. xxxiv + 383. \$2.75.

The conclusions of modern scholarship are here presented *en masse*, and the Biblical order is rearranged according to a chronological sequence. The volume is a perfect mine of chronological material which readers and students of the English Bible may have ready access to. It is undoubtedly the most complete text book of its kind that has appeared.

The author does not profess to contribute anything new for Biblical experts, but the Old Testament instructor will find his summaries useful for review and the student will be fortunate to possess so handy a tool to employ in reading the O. T. progressively and intelligently.

The general point of view is that of HDB, with a preference for the position of Driver — if any. Extreme impartiality characterizes the book, in fact too much so; for in not allowing himself more liberty to weigh and judge his material, the author errs from over caution and leaves many a debated question still open where there is sufficient reason to present a more positive result. E. g. (p. 258) "While the traditional order is followed in this volume, it is with a recognition of the strong arguments for the other view" (given in Ap. A., p. 327). Much unnecessary uncertainty might have been spared the student, and improved the work. Instead of saying that "probably" the number 40 (p. 13) is a round number, he should have affirmed it unhesitatingly. Cf. also pp. 342, 83, 334.

Unless there is quite an overbalance of argument upon problematic questions, no decision is indicated, save rarely. E. g., "Others consider that the Conquest was gradually extended over a longer period of time," p. 43. This is a case of needless doubt. Again, "It is quite possible that only a part of the clans of Israel went into Egypt," p. 35; or, "accordingly the Oppression may be dated

c. 1300 ff." p. 34. This mode of expression abounds. But critical results are less fluid than this tentativeness implies. Even when it is said more positively, "The present trend of opinion is against Solomonic authorship and pre-exilic dating of psalms" (p. 118), more space is given to a conservative classification than is consonant with this.

There are certain criteria which ought to be employed to relieve much of this obscurity, and certainly modern scholarship has crystallized more solidly than the wide range of these summaries would imply (though there is no doubt of the author's own better conviction.) For instance, Skinner is to be preferred in a general way to Driver, Briggs to Kirkpatrick, the International Critical to the Westminster Commentary, etc. Such a grading of opinion would have made it easier for the student.

The classification of periods follows too closely the Biblical. The Conquest is separated from the period of the Judges instead of being unified with it, so that these obsolete barriers between Joshua and "saviours" remain unbroken. Instead of distinguishing Samuel from the leaders of the heroic age, he is classified as a "judge." In the Pentateuch the outline adopted follows the Biblical order irrespective of dates (p. 27) which is a weakness considering the emphasis placed upon chronological sequence. One dislikes also to have Samuel, Elijah and Elisha called "great prophets" (p. 86) when the obvious preference of modern scholars is to mark the advent of prophecy *qua* prophecy with Amos at Bethel in c. 760.

Exegesis, interpretation and historicity do not belong to the province of this volume, although their bearing upon the problem of sources is recognized (p. xiii) and some discussion is given on pp. 7-11. The sifting out and grading of the conclusions of Bible research must depend now more and more upon the historical accuracy of statement of our sources. Final chronological decisions cannot be made until a correct measure of authenticity has been taken of the documents. But we shall all agree with Dr. Creelman that our Old Testament cannot be read intelligently until it is arranged in progressive order according to a strict chronological system. For the pains he has taken to furnish us with so exhaustive a summary of the present state of scholarly opinion much appreciation will undoubtedly be forthcoming.

It should be mentioned that the authorities drawn upon are limited to those whose works are in English.

HOWARD C. ACKERMAN.

The Epic of Gilgamish. By Stephen Langdon. Publications of the Babylonian Section, Vol. X, No. 3. Published by the University Museum, Philadelphia, 1917. Pp. 207-227. Pls. LXIII-LXX.

In the year 1914, the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania purchased a large dark brown unbaked tablet, slightly broken, and carrying in its original form 240 lines of text. The tablet contains the South Babylonian version of the second book of the Epic of Gilgamish. It is said to have been found at Senkere near the Biblical Erech. From the end of Col. I, the tablet gives a portion of the epic hitherto unknown and therefore of the greatest interest. The general theme of this new portion is man's redemption from barbarism. The new tablet belongs to the period of Hammurapi. Dr. Langdon has made an excellent translation, has published the text in autograph and photographic reproduction, and has appended a good index to this part as well as to part two of the same volume. The whole work is done with great accuracy, the only slip noticed being the omission of the note-number, six, from the text of page 208.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

Godsvoorstellingen in de Oud-Aegyptische Pyramidetexten. Door Gerardus Van Der Leeuw. E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1916. Pp. 164.

In this dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor in de Godgeleerdheid, Dr. Van Der Leeuw has presented us with an interesting study in the Pyramid Texts. After a clear statement of his problem in an introduction, he begins his task with a detailed discussion of Egyptian pneumatological terms. He dismisses Maspero's rendering of *ka* as "double," as well as that of Loret and Moret as "totem," nor does he quite agree with that of Steindorff as *genius*, but agrees more closely with that of Breasted as a force "intended to guide the fortunes of the individual in the hereafter." Van Der Leeuw interprets *ka* as an impersonal force, of which a man may have more or less; preëxisting separate from its possessor; a divine principle of life, which nourishes and supports its possessor. Then he discusses in turn the words *ba*, *šhm*, *dd*, *hka*, *sa*, *waš*, *špd*,

d-t, *dnd*, *ānh*, *šāt*, and *yahw*. He interprets them as so many divine impersonal forces under different names, and compares the use of the anthropological term *mana*. All are more or less similar in character to *ka*, but *hka* and *sa* are defined as impersonal magical forces, *špd* is force probably in a symbolical form, *d-t* is the power thought to be inherent in a corpse, *ānh* is the force of life, *šāt* is a force associated with the king, and *yahw* is the spirit or force of the dead. The pneumatology of Egypt is as yet very imperfectly known, and no two independent Egyptologists can be found to agree on the meaning of these terms. Gardiner in his "Postscripta" (PSBA, 1917, pp. 135-136), defines *ka* as "essence" and *ba* as "aspect." The greatest difficulty with which the student of Egyptian pneumatology has to contend is the fact that, as Dr. Van Der Leeuw himself states, the Egyptians did not differentiate between the material and the immaterial.

The author then proceeds to discuss the idea of God, and canvasses the Pyramid Texts for material which deal, first, with the cosmic deities, and, then, with human deities. He closes his investigation with a discussion of dualism and the way in which it passes into real monism in Egyptian thought. The work is followed by a "Toevoegsel" containing a discussion of further literature on the subject. At the end of the book are given two lists of "Sprüche" from the Pyramid Texts, first, those discussed by Breasted in his *Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt*, and, secondly, those discussed in the present work. These two lists, especially the second, are exceedingly useful to all students of the Pyramid Texts. Valuable discussions are to be found in the footnotes where "Sprüche" parallel to those quoted in the text are recorded.

Dr. Van Der Leeuw's work is not as accurate as it might be, e.g., his translations are sometimes inaccurate and loose: why "immers" in Pyr. 1653 ?; why place "ik ben *waš*" before "ik ben *šhm*" in Pyr. 886 ?; "niet" is omitted in the translation of Pyr. 883; in Pyr. 939 the second "schoon" should be "genoegen." Transliterations are sometimes questionable, e.g., *n-šwt* should read *nš-šwt*, and *hn-ka* should read *hm-ka*. In Pyr. 673 the substitution of *ba* for *yahw* makes the passage useless for a discussion of the meaning of *ba*. In Pyr. 2075b the author should have noted that Sethe has *nb* for *k*. Van Der Leeuw's references are so often wrong as to need careful

verification, e. g., p. 17, Pyr. 152vv. should read 153vv.; p. 109, Pyr. 507 should read 508; p. 142, Pyr. 942v. should read 943v.; he is inconsistent in indicating references, sometimes he shows the full extent of the text translated, but very often he does not, e. g., Pyr. 1976 should be 1976v.; Pyr. 366 should be 366vv., etc. These, however, are minor matters in a good piece of work.

SAMUEL A. B. MERCER.

